DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 292 942 UD 026 120

AUTHOR Haberman, Martin
TITLE Recruiting and Selecting Teachers for Urban Schools. ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series, Number 95.
INSTITUTION ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Educational Research and Improvement (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE Nov 87
CONTRACT OERI-400-86-0015
NOTE 76p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses - ERIC Information Analysis Products (071) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Viewpoints (120)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Admission Criteria; Curriculum Development; Educational Change; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Inservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; Student Characteristics; *Student Teaching; *Teacher Characteristics; *Teacher Education; Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Recruitment; *Urban Education; Urban Schools

ABSTRACT

This monograph reviews literature on, and presents recommendations for, recruiting and selecting students who will train to become teachers for urban schools. Studies show that urban patterns of poverty, early parenthood, and other social ills make urban school children at high risk for academic failure. There is a critical shortage of teachers in urban schools especially minority teachers. In addition, many of the present teachers are not trained for urban teaching. Teacher training institutions must develop new programs to train, recruit, and retain properly trained teachers. The programs must include faculty and curricula which effectively prepare students for the urban school experience. Full year, supervised intern teaching in an urban setting should be required before certification. The monograph contains discussions on the following topics: (1) the educational reform literature; (2) the continuing and increasing need for teachers in urban schools; (3) admission criteria for teacher education programs; and (5) the future: combining the two worlds of teacher education, the one which relates directly to urban life and the one which is university based and does not confront urban issues automatically. An appendix summarizes the teacher education portions of major reports on school reform. A questionnaire for teacher education candidates is included. The bibliography contains 62 items. (VM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Recruiting and Selecting Teachers for Urban Schools

ED 229 213

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

by

Martin Haberman

ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education

and

American Association of Teacher Educators

ERIC/CUE Urban Diversity Series
Number 95, November 1987

Recruiting and Selecting Teachers for Urban Schools

by

Martin Haberman
The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

ERIC® ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education
Institute for Urban and Minority Education
Box 40, Teachers College, Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Association of Teacher Educators
Suite ATE, 1900 Association Drive
Reston, VA 22091

Editor: Wendy Schwartz

Book Design: WordWorks Typesetting, Hauppauge, NY 11788

Published in 1987 by the ERIC Clearinghouse on Urban Education, the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, and the Association of Teacher Educators.

This publication was prepared with funding from the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, U.S. Department of Education, under contract no. 400-86-0015. Prior to publication, the monograph was submitted to the Institute for Urban and Minority Education and the Communications Committee of the Association of Teacher Educators for critical review and determination of professional competence. It has met such standards. Points of view or opinions, however, do not necessarily represent the official view or opinions of either the Institute for Urban and Minority Education, the Association of Teacher Educators, or the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

Office of Educational
Research and Improvement
U.S. Department of Education

Table of Contents

I. **Overview** *1*
The Rationale for Education as the Public Priority *1*
The Multiple American Educational Systems *1*
The Urban Educational Environment Today *2*
Educating Urban Teachers Effectively *3*
Future Directions *4*

II. **The Educational Reform Literature** *6*
General Trends in the Literature *7*
General Impact of the Literature *11*
The Impact of Reform on Urban Students *13*
Implications of the Reform Literature for Urban Teacher Education *16*

III. **The Continuing and Increasing Need for Teachers in Urban Schools** *18*
Historical Background *18*
Reasons for the Urban Teacher Shortage 19
Ways to Address the Reasons *26*

IV. **Admission into Teacher Education** *26*
Selection Criteria *26*
Student Characteristics and Expectations *33*
Selecting Urban Teachers *36*
The Hard Criteria: Content *48*

V. **The Future: The Two Worlds of Teacher Education** *49*
Schools of Education *49*
In Service Training *54*

Figure I: Vision of Reform Matrix *17*

References *56*

Appendix A: Reform Literature and Urban Teacher Education *61*

Appendix B: Questions for Teacher Education Program Candidates *66*

I. Overview

The Rationale for Education as the Public Priority

The future of a democratic society is only as promising as the vision of its "ordinary" people, for even the most dynamic leaders cannot get too much ahead of the mass of Americans. Indeed, most leaders spend much of their time trying to catch up with already established trends. Unless a preponderance of the people agree on how to think about an issue, there is insufficient support to test any remedy. Nowhere is this truer than in the field of Education. For these reasons, James Madison foresaw our future quite clearly when he said, "Education is the true foundation of civil liberty." As a democratic society, we will in the future be tested on how well we learn to resolve our problems and this will, in large measure, derive from the quality of our educational system. *What the wisest parents want for their children, all Americans must want for all our children.* To make a democratic system work, we must conceive of education as a common good, not a personal one. To fail to recognize that our predecessors and the courts have always recognized the principle of education as a common good—that every child's education enhances the nation and that every undereducated person is a potential drain and threat to the nation—is to back into a future that will become increasingly dangerous.

The Multiple American Educational Systems

Our national educational system represents three major subsystems which exist in a common form in all 50 states. These are the schools in rural and small town America, in suburbia, and in the urban areas. An examination of the 14,000 local school systems in the United States will show that they can all be improved. The rural, smalltown, and suburban schools are systems that are in need of improvement but, by and large, they educate large numbers of children and youth in an acceptable manner. The same cannot be said of school systems in major metropolitan areas. If 75 percent of the students drop out of a high school in Detroit (and in other cities), can that system be defended, or must major changes occur? Our system of education will not be assessed on how well we do in rural and suburban America, but on how well we do in the urban areas.

The "Good Old Days" of Urban Education

The accurate history of teacher education for urban schools in

this country has not been nearly as glowing as stated by those who claim that New York City and other urban schools successfully educated thirty million immigrants. The truth is that the people who make such statements do not have the dropout or push-out rates for the 1890-1920 era and do not know the numbers who were prepared for neither work, or postsecondary training. They do not speak of those who were simply dumped on an expanding labor market; neither do they speak of our inability to assess the degree to which uncounted lives might have been substantially enhanced and a total society significantly advanced had people been more fully educated.

The Urban Educational Environment Today

The data provided by Harold L. Hodgkinson in *All One System* (1985) have become all too familiar:

- Every *day* since 1981, 2,000 children fall into poverty.
- Every year, almost 3,500,000 children are born to teenage mothers.
- Every day, 40 teenagers give birth to their third child.
- Beginning in 1983—four years past—59% of the children born in this country will reach the age of 18 in one-parent families. It is no longer "normal" in America to grow up with two parents; it is now "normal" to grow up with one parent.

Other studies show that of the more than 3,600,000 children who begin school in September 1987, 25 percent will be from poverty families; 15 percent will be the children of teenagers; 15 percent will be physically or mentally handicapped; 15 percent will speak a language other than English; 25 percent will never finish school; and 10 percent will have illiterate parents. These data are nationwide. For urban schools, these percentages are even more staggering.

There are also statistics relative to current and anticipated additional teacher shortages in urban schools which call for immediate action. In 1982, approximately 115,000 new teachers were hired in the United States. By 1992, the number of new teachers needed will be approximately 215,000. The total number of public school teachers is about 2.1 million. Of that total, about 10 percent will be first year teachers. These figures are national in scope and do not begin to reflect the increasingly greater needs in metropolitan areas. For example, 3,000 new teachers will be needed each year in Los Angeles, 2,000 in Houston.

Inconsistent with the dramatic rise in the need for more teachers is the very modest increase in the number of college students who are entering teacher preparation programs. Two years ago, only 4 percent of college students chose teaching as a profession. Today, this has increased to only 10 percent and is projected to remain at that level.

Although it is clear that there will be a shortage of teachers for

urban schools, it is equally clear that rural, small town, and suburban schools will not experience shortages except in math, science, and special areas. The 1,297 teacher preparation institutions will continue to meet the needs of most districts for the foreseeable future. However, the shortage of urban teachers will continue to increase. Even in rural and suburban districts, in each five year period fully *one half* of the total teaching force leaves the profession and must be replaced. The number leaving the profession is markedly higher in most urban school districts. Some argue, conversely, that we don't have a teacher shortage, merely a distribution problem. Others contend that if we simply improve conditions of work in urban schools, fewer teachers will leave and the shortage will be stemmed.

In addition to critical shortages, there is evidence that two other major factors related to teaching contribute to the educational failures in the urban schools. One, few successful teachers in urban schools report that their preservice university teacher preparation is relevant to their day-to-day work. Two, there is growing evidence that utilizing liberal arts graduates who learn on the job will not be a panacea. Training programs for urban teachers must be carefully developed and staffed with trained mentors, although, regardless of preservice preparation, it may be true that those who currently elect to stay in urban teaching under today's conditions must become insensitive.

The problem of attracting and retaining able minority teachers is also intensifying. By the year 2000, 50 percent of all urban school children will be from ethnic minority groups. Concurrently, only 5 percent of *all* college students will be from ethnic minorities. This small percentage is the pool preparing for *all* professions, not just for the teaching profession. Attracting enough teachers from minority groups to develop anything close to a representative number in urban school classrooms is a totally unrealistic expectation—even if every minority group teacher candidate elected to teach in an urban school. Indeed, if every minority group member in college became a teacher, minorities would still not be adequately represented. Clearly, not enough teachers from ethnic minorities will be prepared *unless new methods of recruitment and preparation are developed for untapped constituencies.*

These conditions make it clear that urban schools *and* teacher education institutions must make development of new programs to train, recruit, and retain teachers a higher priority than preserving their present organizations.

Educating Urban Teachers Effectively

There is an increasing body of knowledge concerning the elements of effective teaching. Much of this body of knowledge has been developed in urban schools and derives from research studies, the writings of experts and the experiences of practicing teachers.

It includes generic competencies such as planning, classroom management, and student evaluation, as well as specialized knowledge such as the teaching of particular content (e.g., reading) to particular subgroups (e.g., the learning disabled).

There is also a considerable body of knowledge on the problems faced by beginning teachers in urban schools—their perceived problems, their real problems, and the kind of knowledge and skills they believe they need to be effective but were never taught. Added to this first-person literature are the accumulated writings and experiences of supervisors in urban school districts who have also clearly and carefully identified the needs of beginning teachers. These inadequacies appear among those who have completed teacher education programs as well as among liberal arts graduates in alternative programs.

A third body of literature is beginning to accumulate related to the role and function of mentors—how urban classroom teachers actually help to teach neophytes the skills and knowledge they need. Experiences in school districts such as Toledo, Pittsburgh, Louisville, and others, have laid out an increasingly clear picture of the orientation process.

There is another body of knowledge—largely unused—gathered from the decade of experience with teacher centers, regarding successful means for upgrading inservice and experienced teachers. A substantial amount of this literature was developed in urban schools (e.g., Syracuse). Integral to this body of knowledge is what is known about inservice for urban teachers generally. The American Federation of Teachers has made a major contribution to the extant knowledge in this area.

Considerable literature exists about innovative teacher education programs which, although university based, were heavily involved with urban schools. The strengths and weaknesses of Teacher Corps programs, National Defense Education Act (NDEA) institutes directed at urban teachers, the Training of Teacher Trainers (TTT), as well as Master of Arts in Teaching (MAT) programs in urban universities, have all been compiled and analyzed in great depth.

The literature describing effective schools has, in part, been directed at the elements which comprise effective instruction in urban schools. This literature has also included leadership for facilitating such teaching.

Future Directions

Recognizing the critical reality of the effect of socioeconomic class, parental involvement in the schools, and the level of public support, there is still convincing evidence that conditions in each school building, and the quality of teaching can make a significant difference to the learning of at risk students. It will be of little value to educate better teachers, and then require them to work

under debilitating conditions. The quality of the school environment and the preparation of teachers are inextricably interrelated factors that cannot be improved separately.

The effects of current preparation programs from which teachers graduate into urban schools are clear. The simple fact is that college professors and university programs have not prepared teachers to be effective in urban schools. Professors in current programs possess a broad research/knowledge base and can show how to set goals, clarify, and evaluate. But the professor is rare who can translate the implications of the knowledge base into practical applications for teacher candidates and practicing teachers in urban schools. Education professors cannot themselves teach in urban classrooms for extended periods on a regular basis, nor should they. This is not an indictment of university professors: It is a fact that recognizes a differentiation of roles.

If the faculty in universities have not, do not, and cannot prepare teachers for urban schools, who can? Some argue that only practicing teachers can. While this contention is partially true, teachers need much more than simply the direct experience of others to generate solutions for the problems they face. The solution is that professors and teachers need new, more honest, forms of cooperative relationships. Teachers and selected professors need to work together outside of the aegis of the university where university faculty and university organizational needs dominate their relationship.

The future of urban education will depend in great part on a new form of urban teacher education:

1. University-based programs that would be modified so that a major portion of the teacher preparation program is completed where school pupils are—in the public schools.
2. New preservice preparation programs for beginners and inservice programs for practicing teachers that occur outside of the university setting, but involve selected faculty and classroom teachers in new forms of relationships. This would require the development of new roles for master urban classroom teachers who can serve as teacher educators, mentors, and instructional leaders for beginning teachers, but who will also continue to work part of the day with pupils.
3. A new faculty responsible for preparing teachers that include both selected university professors and master classroom teachers. Extensive inservice training would be required for both. This new faculty would develop a new urban teacher education curriculum and be responsible for the effective delivery of it.
4. A full year of fully supervised intern teaching that would be required before certification would be recommended. *A new form of license for urban teaching would be created which represents an endorsement of special, additional compe-*

tencies beyond those required for current state licensure. This would require modifications in current certification patterns.

5. Functional partnerships among parents, professionals, nonprofessional groups, and the teacher preparation staff that would be created to give these constituencies a voice in teacher education.
6. The fiscal and human resources to support new forms of teacher preparation in school sites would come primarily from the districts and the states. Eventually and inevitably, state funds formerly directed to schools of education would be reallocated to programs of urban teacher education offered in urban schools.
7. The conditions of the schools would be simultaneously improved as part of the effort to reconstruct teacher preparation and inservice programs.
8. There would be sufficient numbers of potentially able urban teachers who could be selected and trained, provided a) urban teacher education is removed from under the aegis of universities; b) the conditions of teaching in urban schools are improved; and c) prospective teachers from heretofore unrecruited or underrecruited constituencies join those teachers who currently opt to work in an urban environment.

While there is no guarantee that any new proposals, including the ones to be suggested in this paper, will solve all urban school problems, one thing *is* certain: current university programs are not adequately preparing teachers for work in urban schools, and the situation continues to deteriorate. The best evidence indicates that many of the factors causing the failures can be identified, and the solutions suggested here could do much to alleviate them.

To attempt less than a full scale revision of current practices in teacher education will just help to continue a situation of urban school failure that erodes the foundation of a democratic society.

II. The Educational Reform Literature

Proposition I

The reform literature claims to derive its impetus from the needs of at risk youth, but proposes "solutions" which, if implemented, would either ignore or exacerbate the very conditions it seeks to reform.

Proposition II

The major impact of the reform literature has been to significantly and markedly expand the body of legislation

governing schools and to codify traditional views of schooling as the law.

Propostion III

The reform literature in teacher education cites at risk youth as education's greatest challenge and defines present forms of teacher education as inadequate, but then proposes "new directions" which strengthen and deepen the traditional advocacies of fundamentally flawed university based teacher education.

General Trends in the Literature

Since *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) was published, there have been between 50 and 75 national reports (depending on how the term "national report," "blue ribbon," or "high level" commission is defined) and between 275 and 300 state reports. It has become common practice for educational writers and experts representing various specialties to comment on "what's missing in all these reports." It will come as no surprise that "what's missing" is inevitably whatever the educational writer or expert values most. We are now being treated to an endless commentary of complaint on how the reports omit sufficient concern for a particular constituency, or a specialized field of study, and how the reports, therefore, are critically flawed. My strong suspicion is that most critics of the reports are really concerned that they may actually lead to some sort of change, and they want to have input. This may be the first time in our educational history that reports are being produced at a faster rate than are the commentary about them, the proposals for funding them, or the analyses of how they can or cannot be implemented. We have, in effect, created a new form of educational writing. It may be termed the "Calling for Literature" or the "Exhortation Literature." This is not to suggest that it is a form which lacks potency. Indeed, the number of state laws enacted and the number of funded follow-ups suggests that when the furor dies down, the "Calling for Literature" may be seen as having greater impact than either educational research or federal funding on school practices.

The "Calling for Literature" has several common qualities. First is the assumption that institutional reform rather than radical change will solve school problems. Increased efficiency and greater effectiveness, rather than new forms of institutions, are the stated or assumed purpose of this literature.

Second, the definitions of excellence, high quality, and raised standards are generally communicated in commonly understood terms using generally accepted criteria (e.g., test scores).

Third, any data or research evidence presented are used to support the definition of the problem, not the solutions being proposed. There are much data, for example, on demographics, and

little on how four years rather than three years of a particular high school subject relates to demography.

Fourth, few if any reports present their own reservations or counterarguments; thus, the "Calling for Literature" is serialized rather than comprehensive. For example, one report will call for higher grades for high school graduation and will leave the obvious effect of increased dropouts to another report. Another will call for higher standards of teacher certification and never mention how this exacerbates the teacher shortage.

Fifth, most of the reports are written for the public, but then advocate many changes that have technical, complex, or secondary implications. For this reason, "experts" are constantly upset by what they perceive as simplistic solutions, whereas the public sees only common sense in the proposals.

Sixth, the "Calling for Literature" recognizes that educational change comes from outside: from the public, parents, legislatures, the business community, and various other constituencies.

The intention of the "Calling for Literature" is not to wield fractionated educators into a force, but to galvanize public constituencies to change their expectations and the laws which govern educational institutions. Professional educators (at all levels, in all specializations) are generally seen as objects to be changed rather than as generators of change. Indeed, the "Calling for Literature" is, in essence, a public not a professional literature, with a few superstar educators serving as consultants. Even in those cases where the majority of a commission or a panel are comprised of professional educators, the primary audiences for the report are public constituencies. I would predict that in cases where reports are not directly or primarily aimed at public (external) constituencies which will then pressure professional compliance, the impact of the report will be significantly reduced (e.g., *Tomorrow's Teachers*, The Holmes Group, 1986).

Some of the literature essentially deals with how to improve the quality of American education so the country can compete as a worldwide industrial economy and as the leader of the free world. Numerous quality initiatives were proposed and implemented quickly. They generated a number of reactive reports regarding equity; these are fewer in number, less widely read, infrequently cited, less endowed with funds or a national platform, and of significantly less influence (e.g., the Education Commission of the States' *Reconnecting Youth*, 1985; National Coalition of Advocates for Students' *Barriers to Excellence*, 1985; and the National Commission on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics, *Making Something Happen*, 1985).

Other "Calling for Literature" calls for excellence *and* equity; the proposed (and implemented) reforms, however, emphasize raising standards with little or no regard for real effects on access or equity. In the few cases of thoughtful analysis, which deal with the

issue of impact, the reforms are shown to be potentially detrimental to all students, not merely those at risk (Cuban, 1986). There is a persistent, continuing disregard of not only the current needs of the poor and minorities but of the detrimental impact which implementing many of the reforms is likely to have on future access and equity. As callous as this may seem, there is a second error which appears even more calculated. In an overwhelming number of instances, the reports begin with demographics as the statement of the problem. The recommendations for action, which come later (when the demographics are forgotten), are inevitably unrelated to the social issues. First, the reports begin by citing facts such as:

- 45 percent of black children, 36 percent of Hispanic children, and 25 percent of all children live in poverty (Congressional Budget Office, 1985).
- there has been a 6,000 percent increase in drug use since 1960 (Scarpitti & Dalsman, 1980.
- teenage homicides are up 200 percent since 1950 and delinquency is up 130 percent since 1960 (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1986).
- teenage unemployment is up every year (Rumberger, 1985).
- dropouts are over 50 percent in many cities (Peng, 1986).
- 40 teenagers give birth to their third child every day (Hodgkinson, 1986). The rate of births to teenagers is twice that of any other Western nation.
- over 54 percent of school-age children do not live with two parents (Hodgkinson, 1986). Sixty percent of today's 4-year-olds will be raised in single parent families.

Introductions which are thoroughly laced with these data also frequently include student achievement data which unfavorably compare American students with foreign students (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983). The reader now knows what's wrong: our students are not learning enough and the nature of our students is changing in significant ways at a rapid rate. The recommendations (solutions) then deal with achievement as it affects students who are not at risk and ignore the students defined as the essential problem. The primary emphasis of the seven reports most influential in initiating the entire "Calling for Literature" ends up recommending specific core high school subjects about which students must learn more. The "focus seems ironic in a society that will shortly have computerized libraries and other knowledge and data banks" (Edelfelt, 1985). The worst that might be said of this literature is that it is a systematic, widespread attempt to pay lip service to the poor and minorities but then ignore the development of educational services to meet their needs—even when these students comprise an overwhelming majority of the 9,000,000 students in the 120 largest school

districts. The best that might be said of a literature that defines the problem as social conditions which threaten the core of our society and then proceeds to solutions which advocate raising standards using traditional criteria is that its writers simply don't know what to do.

> To date there have been few systematic attempts to categorize and evaluate the multitude of activities already under way to help young people at risk. We have little information about how many youngsters are being served in what ways, what staffing practices dominate, what resources have been devoted to these efforts, and how they are governed. Even more important, we know little about the factors that contribute to their success or the policy environments needed to replicate them. (Brown, 1986)

It should go without saying, but unfortunately does not, that we need greater not diminished efforts to collect and disseminate information related to at risk students. Pretending that at risk students are invisible (or will disappear) by advocating initiatives aimed at the middle class, or by treating the education of at risk students as subject to the same principles which govern non-urban schooling is folly of monumental proportions. Schooling is a function of not only teaching subject matter but of analyzing the interactions among the nature of the student, the nature of the school, and the nature of teaching. How these three realms interact makes urban schooling a different order of enterprise, not merely a difference of degree. Were this not true, we would not have a system failing to serve the poor and minorities coexisting with a system which is essentially sound for suburban, small town, and rural America.

One of the fundamental reasons for this crisis—a crisis of equity and access for at risk students—is that teacher education has not dealt with preparing urban teachers. In the same way that it has become common to pretend that at risk students do not exist, an analogous theme has become common in teacher education: that preparing teachers for urban schools is no different from preparing teachers generally. In effect, the problem of urban teachers who are ineffective, or non-existent, or who never even apply to work in urban schools, is not perceived by teacher educators as any more of a distinctive problem than at risk students. Neither urban students nor urban teachers are perceived as having special needs which create and require a different order of school activity.

The term "urban education" is used in the remainder of this paper to denote two forms of disadvantagement: the range of student characteristics embodied by the term "at risk"; and the range of debilitating, bureaucratic school conditions which make teaching in the nation's largest 120 school districts a special order of work. These conditions affect both teachers' perceived and real state of efficacy: i.e., their ability to influence the conditions of

work which control the learning of their students. Before dealing with the recruitment and selection of students into teacher education, it would be useful to devote some analysis to the actual effects of the "Calling for Literature." This will provide necessary background since teacher education (for urban schools as well as in general) is directly and markedly influenced by this literature—not only in terms of what is done to specifically prepare urban teachers, but even more, in terms of what is not done to prepare them.

General Impact of the Literature

A Nation at Risk (NCEE, 1983) did not emerge from a vacuum. Several trends developed during the 1970s which gave impetus to the apparent need for greater state centralization of control over schools and teachers. During this decade, the growing accountability movement and are increasing public concern with declining test scores seemed to be of little interest to education groups focused on collective bargaining and opposing accountability programs and state-level testing of students. When the reform proposals began appearing in the 1980s, the public had already been well prepared to believe that something must be done to improve (restore) academic standards. But even with this preparation of over a decade, "Neither the individuals responsible for writing the reform reports nor the educational establishment were able to judge accurately the breadth and depth of public support for educational reform" (Pipho, 1986, p. 269).

In 1983, Mississippi, California, Florida, and Arkansas legislatures enacted a range of new laws, from new forms of administration and finance to specific requirements for promotion, courses and basic skills tests. In 1984, New Jersey, Tennessee, Texas, and South Carolina followed suit with omnibus reform packages. In 1985, Georgia, California (again), Massachusetts, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Illinois wrote wide-ranging new education laws. In 1986, New Mexico approved a reform program that included eliminating teacher tenure but requiring local districts to pay higher salaries as a trade-off. Such reforms carried increased state expenditures, as well as numerous state mandates directed at local districts and teacher preparing institutions. The reforms defy summarization: they would "lead to a chart that devotes more space to footnotes than to displaying information" (Pipho, 1986, p. 270).

In some states, governors took the lead; in others it was the state legislature. In some instances there was an omnibus bill; in other cases, a series of enactments. In some instances the measures were written in the form of permanent legislation; in other cases, the bills were on a pilot basis with sunset provisions. The topics covered include: school board powers; training, evaluation and testing of administrators; school planning and accountability; the concept of school bankruptcy; district reorganization; class size;

targeting instructional resources; mandating early childhood programs; intervention programs for at risk students; tax reform; adult illiteracy; computers; school calendars; parental involvement; discipline; programs for special populations as well as guidance; admission and graduation standards at all levels; competency testing; high school graduation requirements; athletic requirements; home instruction; policies related to promotion, retention, grading and testing; all manner of curriculum content change; teacher certification, training, testing and evaluation; incentives, career ladders, and merit pay; alternative certification; instructional time and staff development; and forgivable loans for teachers.

Pipho (1986) summarizes these two into reform themes: more rigorous academic standards for students, and more recognition and higher standards for teachers. Since 1980, 45 states have raised requirements for earning a standard high school diploma. In states where standards had formerly been left to individual districts, the state instituted controls. Math requirements were raised in 42 states; 34 states raised their science requirments; 26 states changed social studies requirements; 18 states changed language arts requirements; 14 states changed physical education requirements; 8 states required some study in foreign language; and 6 states required computer literacy or computer science courses. If *A Nation at Risk*'s recommended list of courses is used as a criterion, 15 states meet the standard in social studies and English, 10 in math, 6 in computer science, 4 in science and none in foreign language study. Other less publicized changes include the fact that 15 states changed the year compulsory schooling begins, the end of mandatory schooling, or both.

Changes affecting standards and/or compensation for teachers have been enacted in all but 12 states. In some instances there are mandates or incentives to local districts; in 13 states there are comprehensive structural changes at the state level and in 12 others there are more cautious statewide initiatives. There are now 36 states which require teacher testing for initial certification.

Some argue that the reform movement is now grinding down, as evidenced by fewer legislative initiatives in 1986. The concept undergirding this view is that every constituency has a brake and none has a motor: many constituencies can—by themselves—block reform, while no one constituency is really capable of making reform work. The end of the reform argument also cites the fact that there are economic problems in oil-producing and agricultural states. Also, several of the governors who made political capital out of educational reform are now out of office. Those who contend that reform will continue point to the approximately 275-300 state-level task forces in operation since 1983 and the fact that every single state has taken some form of action since 1983. They contend that career ladders in 30 states, higher high school

graduation requirements in 45 states, and some form of change in teacher training and certification in almost every state must have a degree of continuing impact.

Whether the reforms increase or decrease in number, or whether they take new forms, will shortly become evident. For our purposes the issue is the impact of these efforts on at risk students and the preparation of their teachers.

The Impact of Reform on Urban Students

The conventional wisdom seems to be that the educational reforms have not hurt at risk students because the nationwide dropout rate seems to be hovering at approximately 27 percent, and the nationwide dropout rate for vocational education has not shown an increase. This approach is wrong and dangerous for several reasons. In an economy in which reasonably compensated jobs for non-high school graduates were plentiful, the dropout rate was less critical. In our present and future economy, reasonably compensated unskilled jobs will continue to disappear. The effect of dropping out is significantly different from former times. For this constituency there will be greater dependence on welfare, unemployment assistance, and participation in illegal activity. A system of calculating these costs estimates that approximately 12,000 dropouts from the Chicago schools in 1982 will cost taxpayers $60 million each year for the next 40 years or $2.5 billion dollars over their lifetime (Levin, 1972). It is important to note that this number of 12,000 is an annual figure from one city, in the same way the estimate that there are approximately 3.3 million teenage births in the United States each year is an annual, repeating figure (Hodgkinson, 1985). While the media focus on Libya and international terrorism, we in the United States give birth to an at risk population the size of Libya each year and destine them to lives of desperation, and the nation as a whole to decreased productivity and increased urban terrorism.

The general figure of 73 percent for high school completion is another misleading statistic:

> Survey approaches give the impression that . . . there is an average of 27 percent dropouts. In fact, there are wide variances in dropout rates across urban systems: in Chicago, individual school dropout rates vary between 11 and 63 percent . . . (several) factors have combined to produce a subset (nearly a third) of schools that receive . . . entering students ill-prepared for high school work. (Hess, 1986)

The estimates for particular urban schools vary: dropouts from some schools in Detroit go as high as 75 percent. The important point is that general survey data mask and underplay this greatly varied situation and undermine approaches to dealing with

critical situations where they exist (Wehlage & Rutter, 1986).

In addition to not knowing how to count dropouts and ignoring the incredible personal, social and real costs involved, the proportion of disadvantaged students is high and increasing rapidly. While there is no precise method of estimating the total number of disadvantaged children/youth in the U.S., it is possible to estimate the number in poverty and the numbers with handicapping conditions.

These data create the spectre of a dual educational system with the lower tier composed of a majority of economically deprived non-whites, immigrants, impoverished whites and a range of students with handicapping conditions—concentrated in the 120 largest urban school districts. In these districts the majority of students are classified as "special." Estimates made as recently as four years ago now seem to have been understated.

> If we assume that about three quarters of minority students meet the economic and/or cultural-linguistic criteria, that accounts for almost 8 million disadvantaged students in 1982. About 40 percent of minority students met the poverty criterion alone in 1983. . . . If we augment that total by the estimated 14 percent of nonminority students who live in poverty, another 4 million are included for a total of about 12 million disadvantaged students out of a total of 40 million in 1982 . . . disadvantaged students accounted for about 30 percent of elementary and secondary students in 1982, and the proportion is increasing. . . . in 1982 the U.S. Department of Education estimated that 42 percent of all children between 5 and 14 had limited proficiency in English . . . and this total does not include the high number of disadvantaged dropouts who left school but are less than 18 years old. Further, the evidence suggests . . . the disadvantaged population is being augmented by poor immigrants. . . . the challenge to American education posed by disadvantaged students will rise precipitously at a time when even the present needs of educationally disadvantaged students have not been addressed satisfactorily. (Levin, 1985, p. 8).

How do the reforms which have responded to the "Calling for Literature" affect disadvantaged constituencies? In sum, the most common and prominent reforms have been the following:

- competency standards for high school graduation;
- more required high school courses in math, science, English, and social studies;
- lengthened school days and school years;
- more demanding textbooks and instructional materials;
- higher salaries, merit pay, and career ladders for teachers; and
- higher teacher standards of teacher licensing, hiring, and retention.

Many of these and other changes are irrelevant to disadvantaged populations. Others create additional barriers to high school completion without providing the additional resources and assistance needed by at risk students to meet the new standards. There is a Wizard of Oz quality to calling for or enacting a state law which mandates higher quality with no recognition that there must also be new and better ways to meet these standards. *The unforeseen and most dangerous result of the "Calling for Literature" is the widespread myth that announcing, or legislating, or demanding higher educational standards is, by itself, a viable means for achieving such higher standards—that somehow we have expended sufficient effort and resources through the process of exhortation.*

There is a compelling argument that the reforms serve as obstacles to the disadvantaged. General reforms aimed at more numerous and rigorous requirements in the absence of explicit ways to improve the quality of educational services offered to at risk students can only, in the long run, turn an increasing number of them into dropouts. Setting competency standards for graduation, while a worthwhile goal, also requires special, added efforts. At risk youth who even try to begin high school with a three-year (or more) handicap in achievement will not catch up *because* the curriculum has been reorganized from courses into competencies. Extra and more effective instruction, more and better materials, smaller class size, more appropriate grouping patterns, greater community involvement, and other costly factors must all come into play. The same argument can be made in response to lengthening school calendars or adding more course requirements. If educational efforts are not targeted at the at risk constituencies, physical and psychological dropping out will increase. Lengthening one's time in an environment perceived as debilitating, or in courses which cannot be understood, multiplies and enhances failure. Understandably, the new rigor is, in part, a reaction to high schools with low standards which, in the past, graduated students obviously deficient in skills. The opposite procedure—mandating higher standards—is not a solution. If mandating higher quality were actually a workable strategy rather than a form of community catharsis, at risk students would have already been transformed into successful ones between 1983 and 1986.

The widespread popularity and political strength of the reform legislation makes it clear that the reform movement is really directed at Middle America. Neither the educational community nor the media have focused on the irrelevance or the likely negative impact of the reforms on at risk students. One explanation for this might be that the general public simply does not believe that the quality of their lives is lowered (or threatened) by neglecting at risk students. Another explanation might be that the general public is dubious that there are any solutions for at risk students, and

simply want to seek to upgrade "regular students."

Implications of the Reform Literature for Urban Teacher Education

The reform literature did not begin with the five major commission reports and the books published in 1983, but that was the year in which the media began to solidify the reform literature in the public mind.

On a reduced level, there have also been a few reform reports aimed directly at teacher education. (Appendix A summarizes the impact of these and subsequent reports and books on teacher education.) The most notable, of course, are *Tomorrow's Teachers* (The Holmes Report, 1986) and *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum, 1986). Less publicized was the *NCATE Redesign* (National Council for Accredition of Teacher Education, 1985). These three reports were analyzed by a blue ribbon task force of the Association of Teacher Educators in *Visions of Reform* (Sikula, Collins, Cruickshank, Eicher, Hobar, Marockie, Robins, & Schucky, 1986). Figure I summarizes the topics that were covered in these reports. Except for the first item, "Recruiting Minority Teachers," none of the topics considered in these reports is directly aimed at urban teacher education. This matrix accurately reflects the reports which pay lip service to the demographic dynamic but which have nothing *substantive* to say about preparing urban teachers. Unfortunately, this is also true for *A Call for Change in Teacher Education* (McGrath, 1985). It would be accurate to state that America's leading teacher educators (with *very* few exceptions) regard teacher education as a generic process. They are all so focused on trying to legitimize teacher education as a reputable profession and as a *bona fide* field for scholarly university inquiry that they cannot simultaneously deal with reality: if teacher education cannot be made relevant to urban schools it will be neither a profession nor a university discipline.

Figure I: **Visions of Reform Matrix**

	NCATE Redesign	Holmes Group	Carnegie Forum
Recruit Minority Teachers	x	x	x
Require Basic Skills and Liberal Arts Background	x	x	x
Ensure Subject-Matter Competence	x	x	x
Develop Clinical Experience and Demonstration Schools	x	x	x
Promote Internships and Residencies	x	x	x
Support Teacher Induction	x	x	x
Encourage Multiple Evaluations	x	x	x
Implement a Systematic Knowledge Base	x	x	x
Develop a Coherent Professional Curriculum	x	x	x
Provide Additional Resources for Teacher Preparation	x	x	x
Encourage Experimentation and Innovation	x		
Develop School Technology	x		x
Increase Teacher Responsibilities and Authority		x	x
Require Bachelor's Degree Prior to Professional Study		x	x
Extend Formal Preparation and Certification Period		x	x
Admit Novices Contingent Upon Testing		x	x
Differentiate Career Opportunities		x	x
Improve Teacher Salaries and Working Conditions		x	x
Relate Student Performance and Teacher Incentives			x
Create a National Board			x
Eliminate Undergraduate Education Majors		x	x

Source: Sikula, J., et al. (eds.). (1986, November). *Visions of Reform.* Reston, PA: Association of Teacher Educators, p. 21.

III. The Continuing and Increasing Need for Teachers in Urban Schools

Proposition IV

Since 1800, there has been a continuing shortage of teachers qualified to teach in urban schools; the number of beginners who simply pass through urban schools, the number of unlicensed and out-of-license, and the number of burnouts are just now becoming more adequately documented.

Proposition V

The present student constituencies comprising teacher education programs are unlikely to enter or remain in urban teaching.

Proposition VI

The situational press of most universities (i.e., their culture, history, reward system, and setting) precludes them from preparing urban teachers.

Proposition VII

The causes for the shortage of urban teachers are well known; the issue is that those responsible for teacher education and licensure prefer not to act on them.

Historical Background

During the Great Depression of the 1930s many urban high schools included Ph.D.s on their teaching staffs. In the late 1970s there were RIFs (Reductions in Force) in several urban districts. With these exceptions, there has been a continuing, persistent need for more urban teachers.

In 1803, in an effort to teach the large number of children who had emigrated from the London slums, the New York City schools adopted the monitoring methods of Joseph Lancaster. Using a system whereby older boys tutored younger ones, this method allowed for class sizes of up to 1,000 at low cost to the taxpayers.

The notion that there is a continuing need for urban teachers because the urban population continues to grow is simplistic for several reasons. During periods of white flight from selected urban areas, the total population of schoolage children does not increase; only the number of minority schoolage students increases. Second, the urban teacher shortage persists through periods of general teacher oversupply. Third, there is a shortage of urban teachers in selected subject areas and grade levels during periods when teachers with these same specialties appear to be in oversupply in non-urban areas. Finally, one cause of the shortage, whose significance has not been determined, has been the hiring practices and assignment procedures of selected urban school districts: for

example, in some systems beginners may not know the grade level or the subjects they will teach, or even the school where they will work until after the school year begins; in some urban districts there is a genuine, aggressive attempt to hire minority teachers, and vacancies are held open beyond the point when majority applicants with other options will wait; in some urban school systems there is a rule, or a strong preference, to hire only teachers who live in the school district.

Reasons for the Urban Teacher Shortage

Before projecting cures or ameliorative policies, it would be helpful to review the possible reasons for the continuing n for urban teachers. The thirteen which follow may not be exh stive but they account for most of the literature and folk wisdom among professional educators and others who consider the problem. These reasons are not mutually exclusive, and, there is a temporal quality to the analyses; different explanations are favored during different time periods.

1. *Supply and demand* of college graduates for other occupations has some relationship to the size of the pool from which urban teachers are drawn. Expanding occupations which carry higher salaries and higher social status than teaching are frequently cited as explanations of shortage.

Thoughtful analysts might be careful about the ease of this explanation. It is not uncommon for experienced teachers to leave teaching when there are outside opportunities. During periods of contraction in the general economy, however, those who have left do not generally return to teaching. The supply-demand explanation may be more of a one-way explanation than a two-way response to expansions *and* contractions in the general economy.

The responses of beginners may be more related to the fluctuations of supply and demand for college graduates in general. Those entering programs of teacher education or beginning their first teaching jobs are more affected by contractions in the general economy than are experienced teachers who have already left the field.

While the single issue of salary does not account for the entire push/pull on teachers to enter or leave urban schools, it is noteworthy that a major source of experienced teachers for some urban schools now comes from nearby parochial schools staffed by lay teachers earning lower salaries. In some metropolitan areas there are even "gentlemen's agreements" between school superintendents and church officials to not raid parochial school faculties.

The conditions for entering and leaving teaching are sufficiently cumbersome, and the reasons individuals choose to leave, or remain in teaching are sufficiently complex to prevent a clearcut

relationship of supply and demand to out-of-teaching opportunities. But some relationship does exist and it seems to affect the choices of those seeking to enter Schools of Education, or seeking their first jobs, more than it affects experienced teachers or those who have left the field.

The real supply and demand issue—rarely discussed—is internal to the profession: i.e., How does the supply and demand for teaching jobs in suburbs and small towns, perceived as more desirable, affect the need for urban teachers? At present, there are urban districts in need of hundreds of teachers, surrounded by contiguous suburbs with several hundred highly qualified applicants for each vacancy.

2. *Out-of-teaching career opportunities for women* have expanded in recent years. As the need for classroom teachers decreased (1975-1983) the opportunities for women graduates increased in several professions. In the past decade universities consistently report increasing numbers of women students in law, business, engineering, architecture and other traditionally male professions. Many of these more able women would have been limited to teaching, nursing, social work, and library science in previous periods.

The opposite effects are also attributed to the women's movement. Astin (1981) argues that twice as many women are pursuing college careers as did so 14 years ago and this, obviously, is an increase in the total pool. Weaver (1983) argues that rumors about demand for teachers has a great impact on talent shifts and that the women's movement actually has a positive effect on the number of high quality, potential teachers. The conventional wisdom is summarized by Feistritzer (1983, p. 1): "New opportunities for women in a wide range of professions within the United States are denying education the choice of the brightest and most creative women in the society." The bottom line is that in the 1960s 40 percent of women freshmen intended to become teachers; by fall 1985 this percentage was less than 10 percent (American Council on Education, 1986).

Again, it would be simplistic to overemphasize this single explanation since there is no evidence that when women were more limited to careers in teaching they chose urban schools in preference to small town and suburban ones.

3. *The conditions of practice* have become the most commonly cited explanation for the shortage of good urban teachers. "Conditions" are defined in various ways but generally include the range of factors in the settings of urban schools which may impinge upon the teacher's functioning; class size, clerical demands, non-teaching police duties, the unavailability of instructional materials and equipment, lack of access to a private telephone or restroom,

and poor safety conditions are merely a few frequently cited examples. There are numerous others, and these conditions vary within and among urban school systems.

The importance of this explanation cannot be overstated. Focusing on the conditions of practice changes the problem definition from one of merely "filling slots" in schools which will remain unchanged, to recruiting able teachers who are willing and prepared to work under different, and sometimes difficult, school conditions.

Considering the range of constituencies and critics now addressing school improvement, the consensus on this issue is indeed remarkable. There is no responsible advocate of school improvement, from within or from outside the profession, who is defining the issue of recruitment of teachers for urban schools as merely better ways to attract teachers into status quo schools. Whether focused on the processes of teacher education, or the procedures for inducting and retaining teachers, it has now become a generally accepted principle that changing teacher education and changing teacher practices are integrally enmeshed with changing the conditions of urban schools. The rationale for this development seems to be the general recognition that urban teachers are not conceptualized as independent professional practitioners (e.g., dentists in private practice), but rather are functionaries in thick bureaucracies characterized by conditions which directly affect their professional practice.

4. *Irrelevance of teacher education programs* to urban schools is also cited as an explanation for the shortage of urban teachers. The contention that teacher education is essentially a waste of time has several components worthy of at least a moment's reflection, since the arguments relate directly to the issue of recruitment and selection. One view is that all teacher education is irrelevant but that since small town and suburban schools still have some semblance of discipline and traditional values, a neophyte teacher who is knowledgeable in his or her subject matter is more able to learn on the job than in an urban setting characterized by debilitating conditions. Another view is that many students come to Schools of Education ready, willing, and able to work in urban schools but are subjected to vacuous courses taught so poorly that their subsequent failure (or lack of staying power) is predestined. A third view is that teacher education programs have never accepted the charge of preparing urban teachers. Since School of Education faculty believe they are providing generic principles for teaching in all situations, they cannot be held accountable for a goal they have never accepted: preparing urban teachers. Finally, there is a view, common to many professional educators, that urban schools are beyond redemption and rather than participate in "band-aid" efforts to keep dying institutions alive it is better to not help urban

schools at all and plan for some sort of replacement institution.

Teacher education is either cited as a cause of urban school problems or is ignored by the current reports. The notable exception is *A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century* (Carnegie Forum, 1986).

5. *Racism* is a common explanation for why good urban teachers are in short supply. This explanation refers to institutional racism: i.e., factors in university selection, state certification, and school district hiring practices which prevent members of minority groups and those sympathetic to minorities from entering the profession. Explanations of racism also refer to individual preservice teachers who practice teach in urban schools but then seek employment elsewhere; and it refers to licensed teachers in urban districts who do not expect their students to learn, and who do not actively teach, but pass their days as assignment-makers and jobholders. There is an extensive, compelling literature detailing this manifestation of racism among teachers (Payne, 1984). The problem is not simply individuals who will not become urban school teachers or who readily quit; the problem is defined primarily in terms of the inadequacy and racism of those who choose to remain in urban settings as "lifers" and who do not teach in an active, enthusiastic manner.

6. *Fear* related to in-class and out-of-class activities is a real factor. Some of these fears may have a basis in fact, e.g., not having a safe place to park one's car. Other fears are the perceptions of beginning teachers who lack experience in urban areas, let alone in urban schools. There is also the general fear of failure, which is a normal condition facing all beginners. Many beginning teachers know enough about themselves and the conditions of work to have a reasonable basis for fearing failure. In some cases these fears are incorrect, resulting from lack of experience, media hype and embellished war stories. In other instances, their self-evaluation is quite accurate; they would very likely fail in urban schools and they are simply trying to avoid such failure. *Currently, only 13 percent of those preparing to teach indicate they would even consider working in an urban school system* (Yarger et al., in press).

7. *The general perception that the day-to-day work of the teacher in an urban school is not teaching* but the maintenance of discipline and other debilitating activities contributes to the shortage of urban teachers. Many individuals self-select to become teachers because they have a need to be loved—at least appreciated—by students who may do so grudgingly but will, in one way or another, see them as people who should be respected and appreciated for all they are "giving." This mental set or approach to wanting to help students who will be appreciative is difficult

(perhaps impossible) for many teachers to alter when faced with urban students who are disinterested in the teacher's feelings or genuinely suspicious of the teacher's motives. In a very real sense a professional can be defined as an individual who makes a "best effort" to perform his/her services for clients who may, or may not, value those services. Such a definition is quite common in the health professions, law, government, and other fields. It is not a definition many individuals use to self-select for (or remain in) a career in teaching. It is, in fact, contrary to the perceptions of those who seek to become teachers.

Perceptions that one is a clerk, or a police officer, or a lunchroom monitor are common complaints of urban teachers. Studies vary, but the amount of time urban teachers report spending on actual teaching versus other activities may go as high as 75% on non-teaching tasks. These conditions, where they exist, frighten neophytes and drive out some experienced teachers.

8. *Bureaucracy* as an overall condition of employment is a critical explanation of why large numbers leave teaching in urban schools. There is a substantial literature on the size of schools and school systems, and the depersonalization which comes to characterize bureaucracies. For many beginners their first recognition that no one really cares if they are absent is a traumatic insight. For others, the recognition that they are small parts of a large organization makes them feel like interchangeable parts of a machine. The need for teachers to use written forms for all requests and to respond through organizational channels using established school procedures is counter to their university experiences and their personal predispostions.

In a recent study in which we asked 54 urban teachers to answer the question, "What does the principal do that decreases your motivation as a teacher?" we received responses such as the following: "We don't see the principal. We check in with a secretary to pick up our keys in the morning and check out with a secretary to hand up our keys in the evening. It's stand in line and say your number—your key ring number."

The university setting places great value on any *individual*—even a student—who raises an issue in terms of "fairness" or "equity." Great care is taken in public universities to protect student rights by providing hearings for their complaints and judging their treatment by the canons of logic. This kind of university experience is the antithesis of how every other publicly controlled large bureaucracy actually functions.

Some define "bureaucracy" as a system of intrusions upon employees doing what they are supposed to be doing to achieve the goals of the organization. Countless classroom interruptions are cited as examples of "bureaucratic" interference with the valuable function of teaching and learning in order to achieve the low-level

goal of meeting the organizational needs of completing paperwork or reviewing rules. Other analysts, however, characterize bureaucracies as organizations which actively *prevent* the organization from meeting its own stated purposes. Whether the effect is to make teaching more difficult, or impossible, the bureaucracy of the large urban school district must be considered a factor in retaining good teachers. There is some evidence and a wealth of experience that some good teachers are motivated to leave urban teaching while other, less able teachers, are protected by the structure of large, impersonal schools. The following proposition is certainly worthy of continued study: Do urban school bureaucracies which are thick with rules and regulations and which are highly depersonalized, select and retain teachers who are "strong insensitives"? This hypothesis derives from analyses of programs for beginning teachers in which the ability to teach in a sensitive manner *and* maintain strong discipline were the two primary foci of study.

9. *Sense of efficacy* is a commonly studied factor among urban teachers. Those who feel they can make a difference in the lives of their students approach their work differently from those who believe that the locus of control over their efforts and their students' learning resides outside themselves. There is some preliminary evidence that some good urban teachers take credit for their students' achievements and perceive their students' failures as caused by conditions beyond their control. This may be a healthier response than teachers who perceive both student failures and achievements to be caused by conditions and people other than themselves. The teachers' perceptions of their efficacy partially influences their expectations for student learning and the potential value of their instruction, and is, therefore, a critical dimension of urban teaching.

Efficacy is both a personal perception and a condition of objective reality. It may be a critical factor in the selection of individuals to prepare for teaching as well as a subject of training so that practicing teachers may be taught means of gaining greater efficacy.

There is no definitive research basis for claiming that more teachers with a low sense of efficacy quit than remain in urban teaching. The problem may be the reverse, that more teachers with feelings of low efficacy stay. Nevertheless, this dimension is, to some degree, a critical factor in selection and retention.

10. *Hard work* is a frequently overlooked fact of life in urban teaching. It may very well be that expecting individuals to work at a job this emotionally and physically exhausting for more than 5-8 years is unrealistic. Indeed, it may be true that those who remain in urban settings as classroom teachers begin to coast, cutting corners and seeking efficiencies at the expense of student learning.

One way to marshall teachers' energies is to limit their years of service as full-time and lifetime classroom teachers. The net effect of the present situation—the pretense that it is possible to staff and restaff a cadre of approximately one-half million urban teachers who are expected to work full-time for longer than 5-8 years—is that the need for teachers will continue to depend on factors of self-selection rather than on planned programs of recruitment, training, and staffing. The folk wisdom of practicing urban teachers clearly recognizes that lifetime careers at full tilt are superhuman, unrealistic expectations. The formal procedures of teacher training, licensure, and employment do not yet officially recognize the actual career span of urban teachers functioning at full capacity.

11. *Geographic parochialism* is another critical but frequently overlooked explanation for urban teacher shortage. In 1985-86 the State of Washington had over 2,000 fully prepared, certified graduates of teacher education programs seeking employment. At the same time the Houston Independent School District was in need of approximately the same number of teachers. Statistical analysis of the national number of teachers available might indicate that there is no overall shortage; there is only a shortage of teachers for urban schools. One remedy tried by some urban school districts is to hire student teachers as aides in the hope of recruiting them as graduates.

12. *Locations of major teacher preparing institutions* are generally in small towns and rural areas, and they serve students from predominantly small towns, and suburban areas. The programs offered these students emphasize practice teaching in schools which are rural, small town, or suburban. The major public universities which are located in urban areas are notorious for not responding to the needs for teachers in their immediate school districts: Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, Detroit, Washington, D.C., and Baltimore are just a few examples. In addition, the largest teacher education programs are typically in small towns and rural areas. In Wisconsin they are in Oshkosh and Whitewater, not Milwaukee. In Illinois they are at Southern, Normal and Northern, not in Chicago. In Indiana they are in Bloomington, Terre Haute and Muncie, not in Gary, East Chicago, Hammond. If most future teachers come from non-urban settings, attend mostly non-urban universities, and student teach in mostly small towns and rural areas, why isn't there greater awareness of this built-in predictability for an urban teacher shortage? It is not simply an "accidental" shortage, but a systematic result of the procedures used for self-selection and teacher training.

13. *Lack of urban teaching experience among School of Educa-*

tion faculty also contributes to the problems of recruitment and retention. My best estimate is that less than 5 percent of the full-time faculty in Schools of Education (approximately 45,000 faculty) have taught for even one year as full-time classroom teachers in one of the 120 largest urban school districts. This means, to me, that the Education faculty themselves are models of, as well as experts on, what happens in small town, rural, and suburban schools. They do not and cannot teach what they do not know.

Ways to Address the Reasons

Combining the non-urban nature of the students in teacher education with the non-urban experience and orientation of the teacher trainers in the bucolic settings of the universities, there should be no surprise in the continuing and persistent need for good urban teachers.

The 13 factors discussed above are interrelated in many ways. They have been separated for reasons of analysis. It may very well be that proposals for addressing these conditions will deal with them in three clusters: several of the factors relate to the perceptions of those who present themselves to be educated as teachers; several factors relate to the nature of university-based teacher education; several factors relate to the conditions of professional practice in urban schools. Recommendations regarding these three realms will be discussed in the sections which follow.

IV. Admission Into Teacher Education

Proposition VIII

Both the criteria used by universities to select students into teacher education programs, and the criteria students use to self-select, are irrelevant to practice.

Proposition IX

Constituencies which are more likely to make effective urban teachers will remain untapped because they do not readily fit the role or stereotype of "university student."

Proposition X

Selection of teacher candidates must become a process which occurs over a period of time and permits a continuous reevaluation of candidates, rather than be viewed as a single decision which occurs at one point in time.

Selection Criteria

Student Qualifications. The single most important *criterion* used in selecting students into programs of teacher education is Grade

Point Average (GPA). Approximately 95 percent of the institutions use the GPA (Laman & Reeves, 1983). The most common method of processing students into teacher education programs is by means of a teacher admissions committee. Approximately 54 percent of these programs report using such a committee. It should be noted that the larger public universities, including more of the knowledge producers, use an admissions committee method less frequently than the state colleges which produce most of the nation's teachers. Therefore, the 54 percent of the institutions using admissions committees account for substantially more individual admissions to teacher education programs.

The level of the GPA criterion is rising. In 1972 the modal standard reported was 2.0. By 1982 it was 2.5. My estimate is that by 1986-87 it is at 2.75, with some institutions reporting as high as 3.0. The higher cutoff reflects changes in the larger, public, research-oriented universities, which have fewer resources invested in undergraduate teacher education programs *and* which are under greater pressure to raise these GPA levels. Universities inevitably use GPA—particularly the GPA of courses in liberal arts and sciences—as astandard of quality. This is currently leading to a somewhat confused situation in our better (i.e., research-oriented) public universities. The various professional schools have always been under some pressure to prove they are as high quality as the Colleges of Arts and Sciences. The professional schools try to gain status by failing as many as possible in introductory courses (Engineering is the most notable example), or by keeping their overall grades low (Architecture Schools are an example). The net effect of the professional schools raising their GPA admission criterion higher than the GPA needed for graduation from the university in general is that many students will be kept out of the professional schools entirely. On many campuses where such "quality" methods are pursued, the Colleges of Arts and Sciences will be left with the *lowest* GPA required for graduation. It will be interesting to note whether professional schools will gain academic status and Arts and Sciences colleges lose status based on such an unplanned turnaround.

The GPA is the most utilized criterion not only because of how university faculty define standards, but also because of the growth in litigation. In 1972 approximately 13 percent of teacher education programs used psychological examinations as admission criteria. By 1982 this number had decreased to 6.6 percent. I believe that the institutions which still use psychological tests do *not* make this their stated criterion of rejection when they inform students. Similarly, over 41 percent of the institutions used physical exams as an admission criterion in 1972 but only 19 percent did so by 1982. Again, I believe it would be unlikely that even among those groups which still require physical exams that this criterion is used as the basis for rejection. The trend in increased

litigation has altered the uses of both the physical and psychological criteria.

One subjective criterion which has remained fairly constant is the use of a pre-admission interview. Approximately 40 percent of the institutions use this procedure. These tend to be the teacher preparation institutions which account for substantially more than 40 percent of the students. I believe that the number of students denied admission as a result of this criterion are very few and tend to be self-selected. Again, the subjective nature of an interview process makes institutions more wary about relying on it as a genuine screening device in our litigious society.

The other criteria commonly used include several which tend to be bureaucratic hurdles rather than standards: i.e., references from faculty, the completion of specific courses in speech, English composition and/or mathematics, and the completion of a formal application stating the reasons for wanting to teach. These are used as checkoffs in the application process rather than as standards by which admissions are actually determined.

The major changes in criteria have been in the use of written language tests (by the institution) and by standardized tests of basic skills (by the states). By 1982 almost 40 percent of the institutions reported using these. This number is now over two-thirds (Flippo, 1986). The reasons for the growth in the use of these criteria are threefold: 1) state mandates, 2) the public demands on academe for minimum standards for teachers, and 3) the natural attraction toward quantitative means to fight off grievances, appeals, and law suits. This contention is supported by the data: the reasons given for not admitting students are most frequently GPA, test scores, or a combination of these, not interviews, recommendations, physicals, psychological tests, or the completion of specific prerequisite course requirements.

School of Education Quotas. Approximately 14 percent of teacher education programs use some form of quota system for admission to selected education programs and to small programs within an institution which may have a limited number of faculty. This 14 percent figure was fairly stable over several decades through 1982. Currently, there are a growing number of the large, public, research-oriented universities in which quotas are being set for all students seeking to enter teacher education programs across the board. Quotas result from the fact that in spite of an increasing need for teachers in the foreseeable future, the knowledge-producing major universities have decided to *not* increase the size of their Schools of Education. This policy decision does not emanate from a simple prejudice against Schools of Education, but from the broader fear of overexpanding all professional schools at the expense of Liberal Arts and Sciences colleges at undergraduate and graduate levels.

There are two decision levels which impact on School of Education budgets in the "better" universities: first, the total university budget must be allocated in a manner which does not destroy the heart of the institution—the College of Arts and Sciences; second, the distribution of resources among the professional schools follows a hierarchy where almost all the other professional schools have a higher priority than Education. (Only Social Work and Library Science have as low a priority in the total university.) In effect, Schools of Education first compete with the other professional schools against the arts and science budget—and lose. The School of Education then competes against the other professional schools for the total professional school pie and comes out near the bottom. The net effect is that the better the university, the less likely is the School of Education to receive an adequate budget, since "better" universities also have outstanding Colleges of Arts and Sciences *and* outstanding Schools of Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Law, Engineering, Business, Architecture, Fine Arts, Nursing, etc. For these reasons the budget outlook for Schools of Education can be expected to worsen further; the "better" the university, the lower the relative funding for Education.

The "better" knowledge-producing institutions are currently taking the position that they will do whatever they can to improve the quality of the teachers *they* prepare, but that solving the shortage of teachers—in general, or for urban schools in particular—is not their responsibility. These institutions, as well as many of the state colleges which have taken a more traditional role of meeting the staffing needs of rural and small town public schools, are now setting across-the-board quotas. As of 1982 less than half (43 percent) of the institutions reported actively recruiting for quality. In 1987 it is the common practice to select for quality—assuming that the best and the brightest are already in the applicant pool and, thus, institutions can turn from recruitment to selection, i.e., screening.

The Selection Process. GPA and test scores are clearly the basic selection criteria. Quotas are being established in many institutions using these criteria in combination. The process of limiting enrollment to the elementary education program on the University of Wisconsin—Madison campus is a typical example of how the criteria are used in combination. Basic skills tests in reading, writing, and math are required, with minimum scores stated for each test. In addition, a GPA of 2.5 in 43 credits of general liberal studies is required. The actual process of using these critera to limit enrollment can be seen in the following guidelines.

> Admission to the Elementary Program will be based on the following:
>
> 1) The first 70% of each entering group will be selected on the

basis of an average of the student's ranking for the three tests and the GPA. Persons whose rank was high in GPA and in each of the three tests would have a higher average than persons who ranked high on some indicators and low on others.

2) The next 20% will be selected on the basis of their rank on any single indicator. In other words:
   - 5% will be selected for their high rank in GPA.
   - 5% will be selected for their high rank on the reading test.
   - 5% will be selected for their high rank on the writing test.
   - 5% will be selected for their high rank on the mathematics tests.

3) The next 10% will be selected based on the following (in priority order):
   a) Minority students if their percentage in the first two categories is not equivalent to their representation in the UW—Madison student population.
   b) Handicapped students if their percentage is not equivalent to their representation in the UW—Madison student population.
   c) If there are not enough students in these two categories, then the more general ranking criteria described in items 1) and 2) will be extended until the enrollment limit is reached. (UW—Madison, 1986)

The foregoing analysis of selection criteria does not address their appropriateness for predicting subsequent teaching success and certainly does not relate to predicting teaching success in urban schools. The criteria universities use focus on college students as students. Since GPA predicts subsequent GPA, the criterion is focused on ensuring there will be successful students in the programs—not necessarily successful teachers. It is little comfort to know that in no professional school do the admission criteria predict success and effectiveness in the subsequent practice of that profession.

In effect, what Schools of Education have done is to behave like other professional schools in the university, that is, to protect themselves against litigation, and to use traditional university criteria for admission. These practices are intended to cut down the internal criticism leveled at Schools of Education from within the university that their students are somehow inferior, and to respond to public concern that minimum standards of skill attainment are being enforced. There is also a growing trend toward connecting graduates' scores on the professional portions of standardized tests with the institutions they attended. The assumption

is made that high school scores reflect a good teacher education program, and when such scores are published in daily newspapers this supposedly informs the public which Schools of Education are best. It should go without saying, but does not, that these practices have little if anything to do with who chooses to teach in urban schools and how well they do. Indeed, we have overwhelming evidence that these practices have yielded few if any good urban teachers and that those who have passed through these selection and licensure procedures are not necessarily going to be good teachers or good urban teachers.

School of Education Applicants. Part of the dysfunction between selection and practice cannot be explained by either the politics of the university, the need to prevent lawsuits, the demands of the state for certain test scores. or the needs of the public for reassurance about basic skills. Another facet is the fact that selection criteria were developed with one population in mind: those who enter the university directly from high school and who indicate they want to immediately enter the teacher education program. This encompasses only students who "always wanted to teach," whether they take education courses as freshmen, juniors or graduate students.

In reality, there are two other populations which taken together account for the majority of people who seek to become teachers, and who represent the overwhelming majority of those who actually become teachers. These are: 1) students who decide during the course of their college careers that they want to teach—college careers which may involve study at more that one institution over periods longer than four years; and 2) college graduates with all forms of baccalaureate degrees who decide to prepare for teaching later. Selection practices in most universities (applied to the overwhelming number of individuals seeking to enter teacher education programs) were developed and are administered as if the "normal" case is a youngster directly from high school who meets the admission requirements in a neat, orderly, full-time manner. All other applicants are regarded as "special" cases or "problems" —in spite of the fact that the "special" cases are now the majority of applicants to many institutions, and *in toto.*

Individuals who decide to teach during or after college will, to some degree, be out of sync with the typical selection process. For example, transfer credits from other institutions are difficult to evaluate: GPAs from other institutions hold various meanings; specific course requirements in English, speech, and math may not be met or are only partially met, or substitute courses are presented; and, if applicants present SAT or GRE (Graduate Record Exam) scores, it is not clear to which referent group their scores should be compared. Moreover, interviews of applicants by faculty committees cannot be readily arranged for part-time, even-

ing, or graduate students, and if they are arranged, the interviewers assume the answers of a 19-year-old female to be normal (i.e., desirable) responses. For example, "I always wanted to teach. I love children. I want to raise their self concepts."

That School of Education admissions policies discriminate against certain types of candidates has never really been reflected upon—let alone acted upon—explains part of the stress felt by those serving as admissions and processing officers, particularly at Schools of Education in major universities and in urban universities. The genuinely typical applicant—in fact, the majority—inevitably appears to have special needs, special requests, and special explanations for not having all the admission criteria completed as stated in the catalogue. Operating in a university environment, those making admissions decisions never think that it is the admission procedure, not the applicants, that must be changed. This rigidity is noteworthy given the fact that we know the criteria being used are unrelated to subsequent teaching practice.

The selection criteria themselves may be divided into hard, soft, and bureaucratic hurdles. Hard criteria, e.g., GPA, can lead to exclusion. e.g., GPA. Soft criteria, e.g., a physical exam, are rarely if ever used as the basis of rejection into a program. Bureaucratic hurdles are criteria for which no standard has been set; for example, completing a course with no particular grade requirement or taking a test where there has been no "passing score" established. It would be perceived as incredible to those outside of professional education (as well as to most education professors) to learn that among the selection criteria the number of bureaucratic hurdles exceeds the soft criteria which, in turn, exceeds the hard criteria of GPA and mandated test scores. In almost every institution, it is impossible for anyone to answer the question, "What would keep an applicant with a high GPA out of your teacher education program?"

To further my contention that irrelevant criteria are applied to the two constituencies who comprise the majority of teacher applicants described above, it is helpful to again consider the application of quotas in an increasing number of institutions. I predict the following: the highest priority is and will continue to be given to full-time undergraduates who pursue their college careers at a single institution. Second priority will be given to undergraduates who desire to switch to education during their full-time careers in the same institution. Third will be full-time transfer students from other institutions who are in good standing. Fourth and fifth will be part-time students and college graduates seeking certification. The latter group are referred to as "retreads" and in other derogatory ways to indicate the negative value attached to people who must be inferior since they didn't decide on a career in high school unlike the "I always wanted to teach" cohort. In reali-

ty, this discrimination reflects the School of Education budgets, which were, or remain, based, in part, on full-time equivalents: part-timers and graduate retreads don't keep the lights on in the Schools of Education.

Establishing priorities, such as quotas, reflects the faculty value that full-time customers of a university should have first claim on a product when that product is in short supply. Actually, if the faculties and administrators who set quota policy were concerned about issues such as those raised by the Holmes Group (1986), or by the experience of those who succeed as teachers in urban schools, part-timers and "retreads" of all ages (i.e., fifth priority) would be given higher priority over full-time late adolescent women (first priority). Of the literally dozens of arguments that can be made to substantiate the contention that universities are unable to prepare urban teachers, the argument over procedures followed for the selection of candidates into teacher education programs is the most compelling. The best thing that can be said about the selection process is that it is immaterial; the worst that might be said about it is that it is a systematic application of university prejudices which effectively prevent new populations, who might very well be more capable, from entering teaching in general and urban schools in particular.

Student Characteristics and Expectations

Of those students who plan to enter programs of teacher education, between 25 and 40 percent knew they wanted to teach prior to high school graduation. Even this wide range enables us to make two generalizations worthy of further consideration: individuals with a long-term interest in teaching, who seek to begin teacher education immediately after high school graduation, comprise only a minority of those who enter teacher education programs; the majority of those who seek admission to teacher education programs make the decision during their college careers or after college graduation.

These generalizations are worth noting since they provide background for a critical insight. Most studies which conclude that education students compare negatively with other students use as data the population of students who knew they wanted to teach prior to entering the university. When education students who decided during their college careers are compared with other college students, the results are mixed—with many examples of education students having equal or better test scores and GPAs (Savage, 1983). Similarly, comparisons among graduate students who, as adults, decide to pursue a career in teaching also yield mixed results. In institutions where post baccalaureate certification requires admission to the graduate school, the applicants have higher (and comparable) GPAs than average college graduates

(Andrew, 1983). In institutions which require the Graduate Record Exam, education graduates are reported having scores lower than, equal to, or higher than other graduates (Dejnozka & Smiley, 1983).

Among the most widely cited researchers of teacher candidates' abilities are Vance and Schlechty (1982, p. 13) who report that "teaching appears to attract and retain a disproportionately high percentage of those with low measured academic ability and fails to attract and retain those with high ability." Another frequently cited source is Weaver (1981), who examined data from the Educational Testing Service, the College Board, the American College Testing Program and the National Longitudinal Study. College-bound high school seniors showing a preference for teaching were not only lower initially in their mean test scores but continued an overall decline in verbal and qualitative skills when compared with other students. Weaver's data indicate that the mean test scores for college students majoring in Education in the 1970s were in the 40th percentile of all college graduates. In summarizing these data Lanier and Little (1986, p. 541) conclude that, "Although such results hardly suggest an overwhelming below average majority, it is a majority nonetheless, and the number and proportion at the bottom appear excessive for persons pursuing a career that is basically academic in nature." ("Basically academic" raises a critical issue. It may refer to the content taught youth, or the professionalization of that subject matter, or the study of pedagogy, or to all three.) It is necessary to point out that many studies produce data to support the contention that Education students are as good, indeed, superior to other college students (Fisher & Feldmann, 1985). These studies generally compare high school percentile rank and GPA in selected general studies courses.

One approach to estimating the academic talent in the teacher education pool is to examine the upper quintile of all college graduates, and to see how many go into teaching; another method is to examine the total teacher education population and see how many are in the top quintile. Using the former approach, Vance and Schlechty (1982) found 11 percent of the highest SAT scorers (verbal and math) went into teacher preparation and 7 percent actually took jobs.

The obvious question raised by these data is, "How many of the 'best and brightest' college students *should* we expect to recruit into teaching?" This becomes a critical question when we realize that the answer is that if *all* graduates in the top quintile were to enter teaching we still wouldn't have enough teachers for the foreseeable future (Plisko, 1983, p. 26). If good sense cautions that not all, not even a majority of the "best and brightest" should enter teaching, then how many should? The consensus of responses to this question seems to be, "something more" than the present 7 percent. Of even greater importance would be attracting

fewer graduates from the bottom quintile. Perhaps the most reasonable condition to hope for is that the abilities of those entering teaching would be distributed in a manner which represents the total pool of college graduates, and is no longer skewed toward the bottom half. It is little consolation that this problem was also reported in statistical terms nearly 60 years ago, for the period 1928-32 (Learned & Wood, 1938), and in general terms during the nineteenth century.

The arguments in favor of students with higher test scores are that the scores "count as proxy measures of competence" (Kerr, 1983), that they correlate with verbal abilities which predict effective teaching (Coleman, 1966), and that there can be a discouraging effect on children if they have "sustained interaction and association with large numbers of relatively slow concrete" teachers in the future (Lanier, 1986). On the other side is the argument that we simply don't know how much achievement and potential for achievement (as measured by SATs and comparable tests) teachers really need. We can more readily agree on basic skills and minimum proficiencies than we can answer the question of how much and what teachers should know. It may well be too much to assume that average or even low SAT scores are proxy measures for "incompetence in teaching" or "concrete thinking." Indeed, we have no evidence that those locked into the here and now as concrete thinkers are less effective teachers. Although it would appear reasonable to believe that for youngsters to be taught higher orders of thinking their teachers must be capable and active in these thinking modes, it may be possible for teachers, following a set procedure, to teach many abstract thinking skills. In any event, until reading the inferential leaps in the literature summaries cited above, I was never aware that SATs were measures of teacher competence (proxy or otherwise), or measures which could identify "concrete thinking" in future teachers.

Generally, studies of entry-level students who always knew they wanted to teach support the stereotypes: 94 percent are white, 74 percent are female, two-thirds of the males express preference for high school teaching, two-thirds of the females express a preference for elementary schools, and 12 percent of both sexes prefer middle schools (Book, Byers, & Freeman, 1983).

These students are overwhelmingly rural (expressing a desire to return to similar settings) and suburban, with few students having had all their previous schooling in urban areas and fewer still who express a desire to return to teach in urban schools. Almost 80 percent of the students document that they were active in high school (and earlier) as "leaders," had high involvement in advanced courses, and little or no involvement in vocational education. The majority of these students went through the same schools in the same communities from K through 12. They were successful and enjoyed school.

Only 57 percent indicate that they plan to remain in teaching for more than 10 years. About half who plan to leave the profession indicate advanced training and career change as their goal; the other half plan to raise a family.

In addition to supporting the conventional wisdom that students decide on a teaching career by observing their own teachers (Lortie, 1975), 80 percent indicate they were camp counselors, aides, or Sunday school teachers. The overriding perception of most of these students is that "teaching is an extended form of parenting about which there is little to learn other than through instinct and one's own experiences as a child" (Book, Byers, & Freeman, p. 10). There is little value placed on teachers' doing very much of an intellectual nature. About 6 percent of white students and about 25 percent of non-white students express a preference for urban teaching. About a quarter of all students express a willingness to consider teaching outside their states.

The perceptions with which students begin their university education seem to be somewhat of a self-fulfilling prophesy. They express a relatively high level of confidence in their own ability to begin teaching immediately. About one-quarter express a high degree of confidence and another two-thirds a moderately strong degree of confidence that they could begin teaching immediately without any teacher training. The two functions they express least confidence about performing immediately are teaching pupils with special needs and managing a few discipline problems. Enhancing children's self concepts is perceived as a higher goal than fostering pupils' achievements or creating a learning environment. These initial perceptions of students who have never even taken Education courses is the basis for my contention that they don't learn anything because they don't expect to; they start out rejecting the handicapped and worrying about discipline and that's how they finish. Again, almost all these data refer to "normal" students rather than to late deciders, graduate students and adult retreads, who comprise the majority of teacher education students.

Selecting Urban Teachers

What are the implications of the preceding discussion? What might be done to better select individuals to prepare as urban teachers? Following are recommendations designed to recruit constituencies which are currently ignored or undervalued, using more relevant criteria for predicting who might succeed or fail in urban schools.

1. *The most valid criterion for selecting teacher education students is to observe the candidates' interactions with children and youth.* The basic hard criteria now used are GPA and basic skills tests. Pre-student teaching (i.e., early field

experiences) should be used as a selection criterion *in addition* to traditional criteria. Universities should be able to readily turn down some students with high GPAs and/or high test scores if these students do not demonstrate their ability to work with and relate to children and youth. In those institutions that offer early and pre-student fieldwork, such offerings are taken for their content value: some emphasize principles of human development and learning, others stress the skills of observation, and some teach the beginning skills of teaching. These experiences would serve a more important function if they were also used as the major criterion for determining who should enter university training programs.

Pre-student teaching experience should be at least 200 hours in length. (This is double the entire field work experience required for licensure as a regular teacher in the alternative certification program of New Jersey.) Part of the experience should require the tutoring of a youngster in regular school subjects. This should be a youngster from a minority ethnic background who needs extra help. A second activity should involve the applicant in conducting a small group, which includes youngsters with handicapping conditions, in an educational activity after school.

At present, universities allocate more than 95 percent of their supervisory time and budget to the supervision of student teachers and interns, many of whom should never have gotten that far. (And in the case of urban teaching, *most* of whom should not have gotten that far.) Effective pre-student teaching experiences would lead many individuals to self select out just as frequently as they would be rejected. Assuming the universities will not be able to increase the total resources they devote to all direct experiences, I would urge that they reallocate at least half (but hopefully more) of their budgets from supervising student teachers and interns to offering field experiences intended to select students. My basic assumption is that if we get the right individuals, they will expect to learn, will learn more effectively, and will be predisposed from the outset to work in urban schools. The present condition is that few Education students ever fail out once admitted; the worst thing that ever happens to them is that, if they are blatant misfits, they are graduated but not certified. If they are simply incompetent they are given a "C" in student teaching. In essence, teacher education is open at both ends—admission and graduation. This recommendation would narrow the pipeline at the admissions end and assume that the early fieldwork, *in urban schools with minority pupils*, would provide a basis for selecting more able and more appropriate teacher candidates.

This proposal will, of course, be immediately rejected by most School of Education deans and faculty on what they believe are valid, *prima facie* grounds—their institutions are located in small towns and rural areas where there is insufficient access to urban schools and minority youngsters. The response should be equally simple and straightforward: universities without access to minority group students and urban school systems cannot claim to select or prepare future teachers for such settings.

2. *A personal interview, which it is possible to fail, should be part of every selection process for urban teachers.* This interview should involve at least one classroom teacher who is an adjunct of the university as well as faculty members. In spite of the fear of litigation this process should be a vital part of selection. While very few applicants can (or should) be prevented from entering a program on the basis of an interview, the extreme cases who can be picked up in an interview will save immeasurable time and effort later on. For examples of the extreme kinds of comments which have been picked up in interviews consider the following three, real (paraphrased) examples:

   a. When I'm with small children I feel like I'm back in reality. It's the only time I feel that way. My psychiatrist agrees and he suggested I become a teacher.
   b. Jensen's data are correct and I believe it. Blacks are simply not as smart as whites. But that doesn't mean they can't learn anything.
   c. The last 14 years of SAT scores convince me that women's academic abilities are lower than men's. They not only score lower than men in science and math but in language as well. It's clear they are not as able. The solution is having a teacher (like me) who is not a sexist and who will give the girls extra help.

   In addition to identifying a few extremely negative cases, an interview procedure is useful as a means of identifying outstanding candidates who might not show up as having high potential for urban teaching. In effect, the personal interview can be used as a basis for making exceptional admissions to the teacher education program as well as used as a basis for rejection. While there will be very few instances in which an interview, by itself, will overrule other criteria, there will be cases in which an interview will be sufficiently extreme to make the process worth the effort.

3. *The first course in Education should be the most rigorous course and should serve as an integral part of the selection process.* Rather than continuing to use courses such as

Introduction to Education, or an introductory course in Educational Psychology, or Social and Cultural Foundations, the first course in the professional sequence should be as rigorous as possible and should deal with the day-to-day work of urban classroom teachers. It should be titled something like "Behaviors of Effective Urban Teachers" and include content that is now reserved for graduate or inservice students. This course should include simulation experiences, micro and peer teaching. An institution's leading education faculty member ought to try to teach these beginners everything that is known about instruction in this very first course.

A second emphasis of this course should be on the professionalization of content. Students would be subgrouped by grade level and subject matter and be required to demonstrate that they have the cognitive ability to translate high level, abstract principles from various subject matter areas into content which can readily be taught to children and youth of all ages and abilities.

The rationale for this recommendation is twofold: 1) to try to counter what we know to be the perceptions of many beginners: that Education courses lack content and are irrelevant to urban schools, and that common sense and one's own school experience are all that is necessary; and 2) to make the first university course serve a screening function as it does in other professions.

The reaction of teacher educators in traditional programs to this proposal is predictable: "Do you really expect to teach students everything they need to know about teaching in their freshman course?" The response of urban teacher educators to this misconception should be clear. College freshmen shouldn't be in teacher education courses! In high quality (and even some average) universities as many as 40 percent of the freshmen drop out or stop out; it is a waste of resources to offer professional courses to freshmen. Second, and of greater importance, people shouldn't begin professional education classes unless they are at least college juniors and have completed the major portion of their general studies. This provides them with some experience in university "first" courses that they might use as a basis for comparison, and makes it all the more important that the first course in professional education be as rigorous as possible. Finally, while it is not possible to cover all that is known about teaching in one class, it is imperative that students have an in-depth dip into at least the knowledge base dealing with instruction. As long as universities take no carefully constructed measures to counteract the perceptions and beliefs with which typical

Education students begin teacher education, the preparation programs will continue to serve as self-fulfilling prophecies for students who do not expect to learn much and then don't.

Taken together, the early field-work, the interview, and this rigorous practicum course should be used to select out approximately 50 percent of those who now enter university preservice programs. I arrive at this figure in the following manner. Approximately 10 percent of the regularly prepared and licensed teachers quit teaching in their first year. Within five years approximately 50 percent have left teaching and, of course, this figure is even greater in the 120 largest urban school systems. The number who leave represent a population who, by and large, planned to enter and pursue lifelong careers. (Indeed, one of the most frequent comments made by those leaving teaching is, "I can't see myself doing this the rest of my life.") Since these individuals perceived themselves embarking on lifelong careers, rather than giving a few years of service before moving on with their lives, they themselves—as well as their principals, supervisors, and colleagues—regard their leaving as quitting, failing, or the consequence of not experiencing the expected satisfactions. The selection process proposed here would pick up most of these individuals who should never have begun in urban schools and who, in effect, used real youngsters in real schools as their selection process—at great cost to themselves and even greater cost to the children and youth they taught, or didn't teach.

Leaving or quitting cannot be regarded in the same way for constituencies who seek to prepare for urban teaching for limited periods of 2-5 years, and do not plan to be career-long teachers. Definitions of "failure" or "quitting," versus leaving teaching for other reasons will obviously differ, depending on the individual's stated career intentions at the outset.

As indicated earlier, those who speak for Schools of Education will be irked by these proposals since they might cut budgeted FTEs and shift the locus of concern from the university to who survives in urban schools. These recommendations are clear threats to existing School of Education budgets—which should be downsized anyway, unless their programs are made relevant to teaching in general and to urban schools in particular.

The issue is not simply fitting future teachers into urban schools as they now exist, however. It is understood, and has been clarified in several places throughout this paper, that simultaneously urban school settings must be improved, since the quality of teacher education and the

nature of teaching in these settings are integrally related realms: there can be no improvement in one without improvement in the other.

4. *Selection should be reconceptualized as a continuous process: accepted students should pass through a decision point prior to student teaching which enables them and the faculty to reassess their continuation in the teacher education program.*

   Growing out of the rigorous course described in #3 above should be a syllabus which includes 30 to 50 specific skills of teaching. These would, among others, include the skills of planning, classroom organization, discipline, making assignments, asking questions, and evaluation. Each preservice student should be tested on each skill prior to being allowed to student teach or intern teach. Unless almost every applicant initially does poorly on almost every skill, university programs will continue to reinforce students' initial perception that there is nothing much to the study of pedagogy. (If students do well initially, there are other possibilities: they are being taught the wrong skills, or teacher educators have not yet identified the skills used by effective urban teachers.)

   Students should be capable of proceeding through these skills at their own pace since the criticism that "Schools of Education don't individualize instruction, they just preach about it!" is generally true. The important point is that students are failed on skills they don't master, and if subsequent relearning efforts prove inadequate, they must be prevented from functioning as student teachers or interns. Student teaching and internships are highly expensive, labor-intensive operations. They also, to a necessary degree, exploit the services of underpaid, overworked classroom teachers who serve as cooperating teachers. For example, upon graduation from Wisconsin universities, only 29 percent of those who are certified to teach take jobs in Wisconsin (Wisconsin Departmnt of Public Instruction, 1986). Since over 95 percent of the teacher education students in Wisconsin universities are state residents, the output of teachers from Schools of Education to the schools of Wisconsin is about one-third. To the degree that Wisconsin represents the nation, it is clear that universities are not preparing graduates who enter teaching at all—let alone teach in urban schools.

   A full undergraduate program is too expensive to the student and to the university to use as a selection mechanism for those who graduate and then decide not to teach. School of Education deans and faculty are prone to claim that professional education is valuable as general education even for

those who do not become teachers, because of its value to parents and to other human service occupations. There is scant logical and little empirical support for this contention. The best general education is comprised of liberal studies, which are intended to serve as general education.

The essence of this recommendation is that Schools of Education must protect their credibility with cooperating schools and cooperating teachers who do not feel like contributing to students' general education (as they do for two-thirds of the Education students in Wisconsin). Classroom teachers have a right to expect that the students and interns sent to them have already been taught at least some basic instructional skills and are not being sent to them, *de novo*, for such skills training. Finally and most important, this recommendation addresses the need for teacher education programs to have continuing decision points, based on actual skills, whereby students can be selected out in ample time to pursue other careers.

5. *In order to be relevant to urban teaching, selection must be a continuous process of evaluating students' reasons for wanting to teach..*

Of the students who now self select to enter a teacher education program, ninety-five percent cite their reason as a desire to help build children and youth's self esteem. Eighty-one percent state that they love children (Book, Freeman, & Brousseau, 1985). These have always been the most common responses of late adolescent, female college students. Sixty-three percent state they want to use what they know with children and youth, but this response lumps subject-matter content with pedagogy. If what these students tell us is true, the traditional applicant to teacher education programs are motivated primarily by their love of children and a desire to muck about with their self concepts, hardly intellectual or academic reasons for embarking on a program of teacher training—particularly if such training is supposedly preparation for teaching in urban schools.

The primary goal of successful urban teachers is to teach pupils effectively whether such pupils are lovable or not. And even more important is teaching students who may not demonstrate gratitude or affection in return. *The stance of the effective urban teacher* vis a vis *his/her pupils is, "I defy you to prevent me from coming up with learning tasks that you will be successful at."* This is an aggressive mental posture that is simply not characteristic, *and may well be beyond*, the emotional and intellectual response capability of traditional teacher education students. While it is not yet possible to initially select and screen future teachers on this

approach to children and youth—particularly urban children and youth who will present larger numbers of less lovable clients—it is possible to make the mental set of future teachers an ongoing selection concern. At the point of beginning student and intern teaching in urban schools, preservice students who have not been disabused of the notion that love is the basis of instruction must be selected out. Space does not permit an analysis of the self concept myth here. It must suffice to point out that this construct has only a flimsy research base and that there is an extremely strong case to support the contention that how people feel about themselves is a function of the situations in which they find themselves and the expectations of those situations, not in some continuous inner state called a "self concept."

Finally, the cumulated wisdom of the craft of urban teaching supports the truism that how pupils feel about themselves is a *consequence* of successful school experience, not a prerequisite condition for learning. The essential point here is that academics inevitably regard these issues as debatable; urban teachers do not. Urban schools will chew up and spit out students who begin with the notion of love as the basis for relating to pupils and who have a proclivity for believing that children/youths' lack of achievement or misbehavior is a function of their "low self concepts." Programs of teacher education should actively seek to change such student perceptions which contravene the successful practices of effective urban teachers; failing such a reorientation, students should be selected out prior to student and intern teaching rather than be permitted to self discover failure. The best evidence we have is that successful urban teachers work hard at teaching the unlovable, are not driven by emotional needs for pupil approval, and see their role as developing skills and academic abilities, not shaping personalities (Payne, 1984).

6. *As a continuing process, teacher education programs must evaluate the ability of their students to function as professional learners—students of teaching.* A recent survey asked the question, "Where did you get the ideas you used in your classroom?" The single highest category—the model response of 27 percent—was, "I thought of it myself." The second highest category was 17 percent and referred to ideas obtained from cooperating teachers (Clark, Smith, Newby, & Cook, 1985). "I learned that from a college professor" accounted for less than 1 percent of what beginning teachers did. If teacher educators are serious about changing the students' self-fulfilling prophecy that they will not learn much in their Education courses, or from

university faculty, the faculty ought to seriously consider procedures which will alter the students' orientations to their studies. Again, this is not a factor that can be used in initial selection; however, it can and should be considered over a period of time and acted upon prior to placing candidates in student teaching or internship experiences.

Students, interns, and beginning teachers must become effective at learning from their experiences and functioning as students of teaching (Dewey, 1904). To do less, or otherwise encourages individuals to recapitulate their own school experiences. Student teachers and interns are prone to "take on" the role of teacher and to evaluate their instructional activity entirely on its apparent effects on pupils. It does not come naturally; indeed, it seems quite foreign to them to be faced with questions such as, "What did you learn about instruction from this experience?" "Does what you are learning support or refute a principle of teaching or learning?" "How might you systematically learn more about your instruction in subsequent teaching experiences?"

We know that inservice teachers suffer professional isolation. It is also clear that to function as a professional means that one has not only the inclination but the skills of self evaluation. Of the many hypotheses used to explain the high failure/quit/dropout rate among beginning teachers is the explanation that they do not function as continuous learners: it is possible to observe the same ineffective behavior in the tenth month of teaching as in the first month. This is partially the result of inadequate feedback mechanisms. It is also highly likely that we are dealing with beginning teachers who repeat the same teaching procedures over and over without learning from these experiences. Failing in new ways, and engaging in more effective teaching behavior, are two examples of conscious efforts to evaluate one's experience and to plan new responses.

Just as preservice students should be required to demonstrate a certain skills level related to instructional skills prior to their student and intern teaching, so too should they be required to demonstrate that they possess the skills of self evaluation and derive benefit from their direct experiences. And, as in the case of other recommendations, this issue becomes of increasing importance in urban settings, where replicating inadequate teaching strategies will be tolerated for shorter periods, if at all. The challenge of urban teaching for beginners is that they have less margin for error before losing the class. The need to learn from *every* encounter with urban children and youth becomes less of a high level Deweyan admonition and more of a ques-

tion of professional life and death.

7. *Master urban classroom teachers should be centrally involved in the process of selecting students into teacher education.* Urban school systems are using an increasing number of classroom teachers (who have been identified as superior) in the roles of mentors, coaches, and trainers of interns and beginners. Such individuals should serve as clinical professors in the university programs which prepare urban teachers. A major duty of these clinical professors should be the determination of who should enter the university teacher education program.

   The first recommendation above calls for setting up early field experience for the primary purpose of selection. Clinical professors should help set up these experiences and evaluate the students who go through them. These clinical professors should also have a voice, with faculty, in deciding which students are actually admitted to the programs.

   The same is true for recommendation #2: clinical professors should be involved in the selection interviews. In implementing recommendation #3, clinical professors should be involved in identifying the teaching skills to be taught, and should serve as instructors where appropriate. Recommendations #4, 5, and 6 deal with perceptions of preservice students, which frequently will be more readily known to clinical professors than to university faculty. It is necessary, therefore, to involve these clinical faculty throughout the selection process. "Involvement" does not here refer to faculty who make decisions and simply inform others; involvement means that the clinical professors should vote and have the same degree of authority as other university faculty (or administrators) in determining who shall be admitted to teacher education programs.

8. *Every institution should have a workably effective system for recruiting, selecting, and inducting members of minority groups into urban teacher education programs.*

   The position that more minorities need to become teachers and educational leaders does not derive from evidence that at risk students learn more from them. And "the minority teacher as model" argument actually lends greater support to the contention that minorities should become teachers and administrators in suburban schools, where majority students hardly ever see them as models of the educated professional. The "need" for minority educators is essentially a philosophical, societal need. What statement is a society making when its universities do not educate sufficient numbers of minorities or prepare them as educators of all children and youth? It is an inescapable

dilemma for a democratic society and not only a question of helping individuals realize some occupational mobility.

There are several ways for teacher education programs to select and prepare more minorities. The usual suggestions are somewhat helpful. These involve coaching in "testwiseness" and in countering students' feelings of alienation (Bell & Morsink, 1986). Suggestions for getting states to consider alternatives to tests (Smith, 1987) are unlikely to be considered, and, if adopted, would raise the spectre of lowering standards of quality. The most common university responses are to expand loans and other means of financial support and to offer remedial programs in basic skills. It is also common for urban universities to start future teacher clubs in local high schools and to engage in other early identification programs. To the degree they are successful, these efforts attract pools comprised of almost all minority females and few, if any, males.

University-based teacher education should try all of these methods. Since the connection between minority membership and low socioeconomic status is a strong one, financial support becomes a necessary but not sufficient condition. Recommendation #1, dealing with prestudent teaching experiences, would provide a quality basis for selecting minority members: however, this criterion must be in addition to test scores or the charge will be made that standards are being lowered.

Three suggestions which have not been generally pursued are worth trying. First, it would make sense for urban universities to seek to recruit minority adults who have completed a few years of college, and to work with them in meeting both liberal studies and professional requirements. The advantage of this approach is that this population is more mature and is more likely to include many individuals who have basic skills and have completed a year or more of college. The disadvantage of this approach is that these students will need financial aid and that part-time students are low priority in Schools of Education. However, late adolescent blacks and Hispanics are no more suited for urban teacher education than late adolescent whites. In addition, by concentrating on this population a majority will not make it to junior level, and even fewer will graduate. Nationally, 8 percent of new hires are minorities, with many states having lower rates (Wisconsin reported 3 percent of its total teachers as minorities in 1985).

A second cohort with promise, although admittedly a smaller pool, are adult minority college graduates. The advantages are obvious; the disadvantages again focus on the need for financial aid.

The most fruitful advice remains untried. Universities should establish linkages with junior colleges. At present, Schools of Education are in the unenviable (and possibly unethical) position of trying to recruit minorities into teaching who should be encouraged to go into more lucrative, higher status, more visable, more powerful professional roles. The small pool of academically successful minorities makes trying to raid other professional schools a dubious practice. The largest pool of blacks and Hispanics is in junior college. Fifty-five percent of blacks enter two-year institutions. Urban universities all have one or more junior/community colleges nearby with whom they could establish a partnership. Minorities (and majority students) who complete two-year programs and who want to prepare for urban teaching could enter the professional sequence in the university. Students could work as teacher aides in local urban schools and help support themselves. The challenge would be to provide the advanced liberal studies (i.e., academic majors) to this cohort but, if there is a genuine university-wide commitment, there are ways to do this. Teacher education should stop scratching around in pools where minorities are in short supply or should be left alone to pursue other careers, and begin to identify and work with minority populations where they exist—in junior and community colleges.

Naturally, not all or even a majority of such two-year graduates will be interested in or capable of becoming teachers. But the pool of potential candidates is greatest in this untapped source, and programs should be attempted. The average age of two-year graduates is 27 and they tend to have extensive urban school experiences. These are very promising factors for selection and preparation in urban teaching. The fact that they have completed two years of postsecondary education also makes them more likely than high school youth to pass basic skills tests.

Why haven't universities simply gone to where academically successful minorities are? Apparently the university "commitments" to minority recruitment and urban teaching cannot compete with their need for full-time tuition.

9. *In order to recruit, select, and prepare urban teachers, systems for recruiting new constituencies need to be developed.*

In confronting the need for more urban teachers, Edelfelt (1986) proposes 16 ideas for handling urban shortages. Some of these suggestions involve redeploying school staffs, while other suggestions involve recruiting untapped constituencies. These latter groups include those interested in job-sharing and making shorter commitments of 2-3

years. He also proposes establishing various cadres of college graduates interested in performing human services in urban areas, and enlisting faculty from postsecondary institutions. The remarkable thing about Edelfelt's list is not merely his thoughtfulness in identifying these untapped cohorts, but the obvious reinforcement he provides for the contention that universities are not at all interested in recruiting (capable and well educated) individuals into programs of teacher education; universities are organized to screen students they already have. Unfortunately, even this screening focuses on using inappropriate criteria with a population unsuited for and disinterested in urban teaching.

The Hard Criteria: Content

It is easy to become bogged down in what may appear to be endless processes. The critical dimension to remember is the *content* of the criteria to be used. Whether the processes for getting at this content are personal interviews, written documents, direct observation, or some other form of data is unimportant. Following are five content areas for selecting future urban teachers which derive from an analysis of the attributes and behaviors of successful, practicing urban teachers.

The first content area is *persistence.* The will and ability to continue to plan new and/or better instructional activities is a readily apparent quality of successful urban teachers.

The teacher's response to authority is a second critical set of behaviors. The willingness to work in, with, and around school authority is vital to the successful urban teacher.

The ability to see the application of generalizations, principles, and research findings to his or her particular classroom is the third crucial content area to consider. This set of behaviors is essentially conceptual in nature and is manifested by the ability to concretize abstractions and to create specific examples from generalizations.

Fourth is acceptance of, and respect for, at risk students. Teachers' definition of at risk students, and understanding of how they get that way, is critical to what they think they can do to teach effectively.

Finally, the fifth content dimension refers to the teachers' need for approval and the reasons teachers seek to teach urban children and youth. An examination of the school lives of urban teachers who are less than successful reveals that they are subject to burnout, become worn down by oppressive bureaucracies, and are unable to see the usefulness of theory/research in their particular school settings. They also tend to blame the victim—the at risk students themselves become defined as the causes of their own problems. Such teachers have an approach

to teaching based on securing the approval of their pupils. (See #5 in previous section, "Selecting Urban Teachers.")

The five content area criteria that are the reverse of these attitudes and behaviors, described above, are the most relevant criteria for basing any predictions about future success in urban teaching; although their presence does not guarantee success, it is their absence which ensures failure. (A guide for actually interviewing prospective urban teachers which uses these five criteria is in Appendix B.)

V. The Future: The Two Worlds of Teacher Education

Schools of Education

The members of the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities (TECSCU) are representative of the types of schools and departments of education which prepare the overwhelming majority (approximately 80 percent) of the nation's teachers. These institutions range from small liberal arts colleges to large public universities and include a majority of the historically black institutions. Many of these institutions have had long histories in teacher education, either as single-purpose institutions or as normal schools. Essentially, TECSCU members comprise the institutions that are continually targeted by reformers as those responsible for ill-preparing America's teachers. These criticisms are not new and go back over a century to the very same criticisms leveled at the predecessor institutions of today's TECSCU members.

While many of these institutions do some research, and almost all offer masters degrees in Education, the majority represent schools and departments of education whose primary commitment to teaching is at the bachelor degree level and preservice masters level teacher education programs. As an organization, TECSCU members are markedly different from Schools of Education in the land grant universities, most of whom consider themselves knowledge producers as well as teacher trainers. Approximately 123 Schools of Education from such knowledge producing institutions were invited to join the Holmes Group. The Holmes Group's total initial pool (fewer actually joined) prepares only approximately 20 percent of the nation's teachers, but they award doctorates to over 90 percent of the individuals who serve as Education faculty in all teacher preparing institutions.

The preponderance of the 1,287 institutions that prepare the nation's teachers are at rural, small town, state capital, and suburban sites. Approximately 17 percent of these institutions prepare half of the nation's teachers (Feistritzer, 1985). I believe

that no institution among this 17 percent is an urban institution. This is not surprising given the historical charge of normal schools to educate rural residents and of land grant universities to provide research and technical assistance to farmers. In contrast, major urban public universities, developed in this century in response to the needs of immigrant populations, without exception, did not view teacher education as their *raison d'etre*, since there were thought to be sufficient numbers of normal schools statewide. Indeed, almost every major urban area had a normal school of its own, frequently operated in cooperation with the local school system.

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges (NASULGC) created a Division of Urban Affairs in 1980. This involved 149 institutions whose specific purpose was to secure federal funds from the Urban Grant University Program (Title IX) of the Higher Education Act. When this could not be done, a smaller group of urban institutions continued to meet in this Division around the topics of how to make their institutional research more responsive to the needs of their urban areas, and how to better serve their part-time and minority students. NASULGC has secured several external grants directed at specific projects which make the total urban university more responsive to urban educational needs; it has not limited its concerns to teacher education in urban schools (NASULGC, 1986).

The major urban public universities have grown up in the last 50 years or less and have not developed the research and funding base of the major land grant institutions in their respective states. For example, as one looks at the Urban 13 in NASULGC it is clear that the major urban institutions in Milwaukee, St. Louis, New Orleans, Detroit, Cincinnati, Philadelphia, Birmingham, etc., do not have state resources comparable to the "flagship" land grant institutions in their respective states. This is important background for understanding why even among the few major universities that define themselves as urban there is an inability to meet the demands of the urban school districts in their cities. While there is little evidence that urban public universities have a genuine, sustained, truly cooperative commitment to their local public school systems, it is important to recognize that urban universities could not solve the problems of urban teacher education even if they tried. They are simply underfunded! "Underfunded," as opposed to merely not having as many resources as they would like, refers to the concept of not being able to meet the institution's stated, recognized objectives. Urban universities are not only underfunded in teacher education but in every professional school. And, in comparison to their "flagship" campuses, they are underfunded in liberal arts and graduate studies as well.

The net effect is that examination of TECSCU, the Holmes Group, and NASULGC indicates that none has accepted the charge of preparing urban teachers. They either do not see the needs of urban teachers as something beyond their generic programs, or they recognize them as something they cannot effectively address. The result is that university students entering teacher education programs will continue to be ill-prepared for urban schools. I believe that students are well aware of this situation and assume, as discussed earlier, that 1) since there isn't much to learn in teacher education programs, and 2) since they won't be seeking employment in urban schools, that 3) they might as well choose a university on bases other than the quality or focus of its teacher education program.

The location of teacher preparation universities is of special significance. The heart of any teacher education program is its professional laboratory experiences—the actual schools where students observe, engage in fieldwork, student teach, and intern. It is not common for students in a university based teacher education program in the United States to have their professional laboratory experiences in the 120 major urban school districts. I would estimate that urban universities and colleges certify fewer than 10 percent of the nation's graduated beginning teachers. Consider the dilemma: every serious, recognized authority will admit that the professional laboratory experience is the heart of the teacher education program, but such experience cannot be offered in urban schools because the major teacher preparation institutions are in rural, small town, state capital and suburban areas. Even the few urban institutions that can utilize city schools as training and laboratory sites frequently claim a metropolitan rather than an urban mission; that is, their faculty feel as obligated to work with suburban and other surrounding school districts as they do with city schools.

When universities are confronted with the contention that they should not be allowed to certify teachers to work with at risk urban youth in highly bureaucratic school systems unless they can provide their students with practice in such situations, they make a strange argument. These institutions take the position that it is not their fault that there are so few minorities and at risk students in schools near their universities and to penalize them for this would be unfair. The issue has now been transformed from one of how to best prepare teachers for urban schools to how schools of education are supposed to maintain their budgets. Most universities, however, don't even try to plead that there are too few at risk students available to practice on; they simply ignore the whole issue of irrelevance to urban schools, or put the onus for proving they are not effectively preparing urban teachers on their critics.

What should be the specific nature of direct experience for

future urban teachers? What would this experience look like? Typical direct experience for preservice students include *pre* student teaching to achieve one or more of the following 10 purposes:

1. Relating to "them." Are these the children/youth I want to teach?
2. Learning about development. What principles of development am I observing?
3. Evaluating one's feelings and perceptions. Do I want to be doing this?
4. Understanding the work of the teacher. Is this a job I am interested in and capable of?
5. Practicing. Am I improving at observing, tutoring, and organizing activities?
6. Deciding on a grade level/subject matter. Is that the content I want to teach?
7. Understanding urban children/youth. Am I gaining a more accurate view of their total life experiences?
8. Orientation to schools. This refers to the process of reorienting prospective teachers into views of schooling which are quite different from their perceptions as recent high school graduates.
9. Observing specific principles of learning in action (reinforcement, transfer, problem solving).
10. Observing new developments in curriculum equipment, e.g., computer assisted instruction.

In each of these modes the traditional emphasis has been on how well future teachers learn, rather than on the quality of their learning experiences or selection for the program. There has been a minimal investment in structuring and controlling the quality of these experiences.

I propose a reversal of this conventional wisdom because urban teachers cannot be prepared unless they have had extensive field work in urban schools. These direct experiences should begin with early field experiences which are an integral part of the selection process. As described earlier, the best basis for selecting candidates into urban teacher education programs is by observing such candidates interacting with children and youth in controlled, specially designed situations. Observations related to coursework should also involve urban students in urban schools. Similarly, student teaching and internships must also be in urban schools. The net effect of this approach is that it would bar as many as 90 percent of our current teacher education graduates from being certified to teach in urban schools since they have not been selected or prepared in urban schools. My answer to the charge that I would be gutting most programs is "absolutely correct." We either have to urbanize

university based teacher education programs, or we have to start selecting different teacher candidates into alternative non-university district-controlled programs, or both.

One means for accomplishing this is by requiring a special license endorsement for urban teachers. Those selected and prepared to teach in urban schools by their demonstrated behavior in such schools may well be certified as capable of teaching statewide: the reverse is done now and should be discontinued. This urban endorsement should be available to current classroom teachers as well as to beginners who successfully complete a longer, more demanding program of preparation. There is no question that such upgrading of the profession of urban teaching will initially exacerbate the shortage of urban teachers. The solution to the shortage, however, lies neither in continuing to send those prepared in traditional, non-urban progams to almost certain failure, or in lowering the standards of what would constitute effective urban teacher preparation.

Teacher selection might continue to include traditional constituencies of college youth, but should emphasize the recruitment of college graduates and other adults whose primary identification and self definition is *urban teacher not university student*. The process of self-selection as well as objective selection involves a significantly different set of criteria and standards for individuals who perceive themselves primarily as teachers (and urban teachers at that) as opposed to those who define themselves as college students. The students' mental set is to see school as coursework rather than useful learning; it is entirely different from the way teachers approach the educational experience. The role set of the student is in terms of requirements for grades and graduation; teachers place themselves in the role of master judges, evaluating the educational experiences offered them against the reality of their practices. Utilizing most of Edelfelt's (1986) 16 recruitment suggestions as well as others, it is possible to implement the higher level of selection criteria discussed earlier and still create enough potential teachers for urban schools. The issue then becomes the quality of the urban teacher education offered, not the people being prepared. By upgrading quality of preparation there will inevitably be a decrease in turnover, which may be the best single method of solving the urban teacher shortage, and improving conditions in urban schools in general.

The Education faculty is the second major cause of university irrelevance. In the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, for example, there are approximately 85 full-time Education faculty. None has taught in one of the 120 largest urban school districts long enough to have become a tenured classroom teacher. I believe this non-urban orientation is a condition not

only characteristic of all university Education faculty but of most Schools of Education, even in urban universities.

The first world of teacher education, therefore, must improve the quality of university controlled teacher education. Students should complete undergraduate majors outside of Education, take coursework based on research evidence, and engage in extended periods of practice in supervised internships. Universities should test students prior to admission and at exit, and impose a certification requirement. These changes will raise the traditional standards of quality.

But what will be the effect on the actual quality of urban teaching? So long as university based teacher education utilizes the selection procedures described earlier, and then processes non-urban oriented students through rustic, small town, or well-endowed suburban schools, irrelevance is builtin and will be perpetuated. To get involved in arguments about whether teacher education is an undergraduate or a graduate enterprise, or whether major universities or state colleges should prepare teachers (when none of them have appropriate faculties) is to engage in a low level of self serving argumentation totally removed from the educational needs of American society.

In Service Training

The second world of teacher education is more relevant but is not yet at the appropriate level of quality. In this world, some states (e.g., California, Texas, New Jersey) have enabled school districts to select college graduates and prepare them on-the-job. Other states are following suit. It has always been true that urban school districts have been able to hire individuals on an emergency basis. New laws enable districts in selected states to operate their own teacher education programs. Liberal Arts graduates (and other college graduates) may now be hired as district employees and assigned full teaching loads. The district (with varying degrees of state support) provides a mentor: a master teacher to be released part-time to supervise the neophyte. Alternative programs also utilize district personnel (and in some cases university faculty) to offer complementary workshops and classes. While utilizing college graduates without professional education as urban teachers is nothing new, Alternative Certification legitimizes the right of school districts to offer teacher education programs with or without university involvement and to certify individuals directly to the state for licensure.

The two worlds of teacher education briefly described above, parallel the world of the schools which divide between rural, small town, and suburban on the one hand, and urban on the other. In the former, quality issues are raised; in the latter, basic skills is as high as most sights are every lifted. And now there is

a teacher education analogue: in universities, is an active debate on how to inject quality into teacher education programs; in the Alternative Certification programs, training issues are usually couched in terms of efficiencies and basic skills. For example, what is the least amount of released time needed by mentors to help a beginning teacher to get going on his/her own? What is the minimal, basic number of workshops or meetings beginners need?

From a recruitment/selection point of view I am convinced the Alternative Certification Programs are getting more of the appropriate individuals to prepare for urban teaching than the traditional world of university preparation. They are college graduates with undergraduate majors in other than Education. They self select to teach in urban schools. They do not begin with the mental set of "loving children" as their primary motivation; neither do they report "raising self concepts" as their primary goal. They also expect to learn a great deal about teaching but to learn it by doing and being helped on the job. They are older and more experienced. They include more minorities and males than is typical of traditional teacher education. They are more willing to reside in urban areas. They are less fearful and rejecting of the urban condition. They readily pass basic skills tests and compare favorably with other college graduates on Graduate Record Examinations.

Naturally, there is much which must be improved in these programs. They emphasize technique to the almost complete exclusion of reflective thinking about teaching. Nevertheless, regarding the issue of recruitment and selection, there is much that university based teacher education can learn from such programs; the reverse is definitely not the case.

Nowhere are the two worlds of teacher education more evident than in Texas where, in 1985, the number of untrained people hired by school districts was approximately double the number of those trained in "improved" university programs (Haberman, 1986). These two worlds will continue to separate, as the university stresses graduate work, the research base, and ever more intricate, sophisticated ways of analyzing teaching; and the urban schools will increasingly stress an apprenticeship model for well educated individuals predisposed to urban life.

References

American College Board. (1983). *Academic preparation for college: What students need to know and to be able to do.* New York: Author.

American Council on Education, Division of Policy Analysis and Research. (1986, October 20). Special analysis of 1983-84 earned degrees. In *Higher Education and National Affairs*, p.3.

American Council on Education, Cooperative Institutional Research Program. (1986, November 3). Cited in *Milwaukee Journal.*

Andrew, M.D. (1983, January/February). The characteristics of students in a five year education program. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34* (1).

Astin, A.W. (1981). *The American freshman: National norms for fall.* Los Angeles: University of California.

Bell, M.L., & Morsink, C.V. (1986. March/April). Quality and equity in the preparation of black teachers. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (2).

Book, C., Byers, J., & Freeman, D. (1983, January/February). Student expectations and teacher education traditions with which we cannot live. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36* (1).

Book, C., Freeman, D., & Brousseau, B. (1985, May/June). Comparing academic backgrounds and career aspirations of education and non-education majors. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36* (3).

Boyer, E.L. (1983). *High school: A report on secondary education in America.* Princeton: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Brown, R. (1986, Fall). State responsibility for at risk youth. *Metropolitan Education*, (2), p. 10.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986, May). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. The report of the task force on teaching as a profession.* New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Clark, C.D., Smith, R.B., Newby, T.J., & Cook, V.A. (1985, December). Perceived origins of teaching behavior. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36* (6).

Coleman, J.S., Campbell, E.Q., Hobson, C.J., McPartland, J., Mood, A.M., Weinfeld, D.F., & York, R.L. (1966), *Equality of educational opportunity.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Congressional Budget Office. (1985). *Reducing poverty among children.* Washington, DC: Author.

Cuban, L. (1986, September). Persistent instruction: Another look at constancy in the classroom. *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Dejnozka, E.L., & Smily, L.R. (1983, January/February). Selective admissions criteria in graduate teacher education programs. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34* (1).

Dewey, J. (1904). The relation of theory to practice. In *The relation of theory to practice in the education of teachers.* (Part I of the 3rd Yearbook, NSSE). Bloomington: Public School Publishing Co.

Edelfelt, R. (1985). *Policy questions prompted by seven recent reports on education.* Washington, DC: National Institute of Education.

Edelfelt, R. (1986, Summer). Managing teacher supply and demand. *ACTION, 7* (2),

Education Commission of the States. (1983). *Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our schools.* Denver: Task Force on Education for Economic Growth.

Education Commission of the States. (1985). *Reconnecting youth: The next steps of reform: A report of the Business Advisory Commission.* Denver: Author.

Feistritzer, C.E. (1983). *The condition of teaching: A state by state analysis.* Princeton: The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Feistritzer, C.E. (1985). *The American teacher.* Washington, DC: Author, p. 60.

Fisher, R.L., & Feldmann, M.E. (1985, May/June). Some answers about the quality of teacher education students. *Journal of Teacher Education, 36* (3).

Flippo, R.F. (1986, March/April). Teacher certification testing: Perspectives and issues. *Journal of Teacher Education, 37* (2).

Goodlad, J.I. (1983). *A place called school.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Haberman, M. (1986, Summer). Alternative teacher certification programs. *ACTION, 8* (2), p. 14.

Hess G.A., Jr. (1986, Fall). Educational triage in the urban school setting. *Metropolitan Education,* (2).

Hodgkinson, H.L. (1985). *All one system: Demographics of education.* Washington, DC: Institute for Educational Leadership.

The Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers.* East Lansing, MI: Author.

Kerr, D.H. (1983). Teacher competence and teacher education in the United States. In L.S. Shulman, & G. Sykes (Eds.). *Handbook of teaching and policy*. New York: Longmans.

Laman, A.E., & Reeves, D.E. (1983, January/February). Admission to teacher education programs: Status and trends. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34* (1).

Lanier, J.E., & Little J.W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.). *Handbook of research on teaching*. New York: MacMillan.

Learned, W.S., & Wood, B.O. (1938). *The student and his knowledge* (Bulletin #29). New York: Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

Levin, H.M. (1972). *The costs to the nation of inadequate education.* Washington, DC: U.S. Senate Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity.

Levin, H.M. (1985). *The educationally disadvantaged: A national crisis* (Working Paper #6). Philadelphia: The State Initiatives Project, Public/Private Ventures.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). *School teacher*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

McGrath, P. (Ed.). (1985). *A call for change in teacher education.* Washington, DC: National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education.

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. (1986). *Joining forces for urban youth.* Washington, DC: Author.

National Coalition of Advocates for Students. (1985). *Barriers to excellence: Our children at risk*. Boston: Author.

National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education. (1985, April). *NCATE redesign*. Washington, DC: Author.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Commission on Secondary Schooling for Hispanics. (1985). *Making something happen*. Washington, DC: Hispanic Policy Development Project.

Payne, C.M. (1984). *Getting what we ask for: The ambiguity of success and failure in urban education*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Peng, S. (1985). *High school dropouts: a national concern.* Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Pipho, C. (1986, December). States bring reality to the reform movement. *Phi Delta Kappan*, p. 269-70.

Plisko, V.W. (1983). *The condition of education, 1983 edition:*

Statistical report. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics.

Rumberger, R. (1985). *The growing problem of youth unemployment.* Denver: Education Commission of the States.

Savage, T.V. (1983, January/February). The academic qualifications of women choosing education as a major. *Journal of Teacher Education, 34* (1).

Sikula, J., Collins, J., Cruickshank, D., Eicher, K., Hobar, N., Marockie, M., Robbins, J., & Schuck, R. (Eds.). (1986, November). *Visions of reform.* Reston: Association of Teacher Educators.

Scarpitti, F., & Dalesman, S. (Eds.). (1980). *Drugs and the youth culture.* Beverly Hills: Sage Pub.

Sizer, T.R. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school.* New York: Houghton Mifflin.

Smith, G.P. (1987). The impact of competency tests on teacher education: Ethical and legal issues in selecting and certifying teachers. In Haberman & Backus (Eds.). *Advances in Teacher Education* (V.3). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary School Educational Policy. (1983). *Making the grade.* New York: Twentieth Century Fund.

U.S. Bureau of the Census. (1986). *Characteristics of American children and youth.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

University of Wisconsin—Madison. (1986, August 15). Memo to "All applicants for the elementary teacher certification program."

Vance, V.S., & Schlechty, D.C. (1982, September). The distribution of academic ability in teaching force: Policy implications. *Phi Delta Kappan.*

Weaver, W.T. (1981). *The tragedy of the commons: The effects of supply and demand on the talent pool.* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education. ERIC Document No. ED 204-261.

Weaver, W.T. (1983). *America's teacher quality problem: Alternatives for reform.* New York: Praeger, p. 46.

Wehlage, G.G., & Rutter, R.A. (1986). Dropping out: How much do schools contribute to the problem? *Teachers College Record, 87.*

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction. (1986). *Supply and demand of teachers in Wisconsin,* Madison, WI: Author.

Yarger, S., Galluzo, G., Howey K., & Zimpher, N. (In press). A national study of teacher education. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education.

Appendix A: Reform Literature and Urban Teacher Education

The first five major reports appearing in 1983 were supplemented by two volume-length critiques: *A Nation at Risk* (NCEE, 1983); *Action for Excellence: A Comprehensive Plan to Improve Our Schools* (ECS, 1983); *Academic Preparation for College: What Students Need to Know and to Be Able to Do* (American College Board, 1983); *High School: A Report on Secondary Education in America* (Boyer, 1983); *Making the Grade* (Twentieth Century Fund Task Force, 1983); *A Place Called School: Prospects for the Future* (Goodlad, 1983); *Horace's Compromise* (Sizer, 1984). What these reports advocate regarding the disadvantaged and teacher education was summarized by Edelfelt (1985):

The Disadvantaged

NCEE - Funds should be made available for special textbook development. They (i.e., the disadvantaged) may require special curriculum smaller classes, or individual tutors to help them master the material presented. (p. 24)

ECS - States should "strengthen programs aimed at more equitable distribution of educational resources." (p. 41)

TCF - There should be "continuing federal effort to provide special educational programs to the poor" (p. 15). Federal attention and assistance should go to depressed localities that have concentrations of immigrant and/or impoverished groups as well as those that are already making strong efforts to improve their educational performance. (p. 16)

CB - Educational quality [should] not lead to actions that limit the aspirations and opportunities of disadvantaged and minority youth. (p. 33)

Sizer - No comment.

Boyer - Business should provide help for disadvantaged students through volunteer tutorial and family counseling service, and support special school and part-time apprenticeship experience for high-risk students. (p. 317)

Every high school district, working with a community college, should have a reentry school arrangement to permit dropouts to return to school part-time or full-time or to engage

in independent study to complete their education. (p. 315)

Goodlad - Let me add here a strong affirmation regarding opportunities for corrective work. It is hoped that the application of mastery learning concepts and improved pedagogy will diminish the need for corrective work, but it will continue to be of concern for some time to come. My affirmation is this: whatever provisions for remediation in a domain of knowledge a school faculty deems necessary must be accommodated within the maximum time allocated to that domain in a student's program. . . . School personnel will be tempted to use the sixth domain for remedial purposes. This simply must not be a permissible option. Slower students are often denied access to learning activities in other fields enjoyed by able students because of their remedial assignments. (pp. 289-290)

In sum, the initial reports include a sentence or two calling for remedial assistance for the disadvantaged and federal aid; Goodlad includes a paragraph calling for mastery teaching and curriculum balance. There can be no question that these documents represent the view that what they advocate is good/appropriate/right for all students and for the nation; that the nine million poor and minority children and youth whose needs are not being currently met by the schools in the 120 largest urban districts need remediation and tutoring, not a different order or form of schooling; and that the demographic realities need in no way alter the perception that these millions of poor and minorities are "special," "atypical," or "remedial" cases—no matter how many schools (and school systems) exist where they are the majority. Complementing this non-approach to the disadvantaged is the way in which these reports approach their teachers.

Teacher Education

NCEE - States should aim "to improve the preparation of teachers. . . . colleges and universities offering preparation programs for teachers [should] be judged by how well their graduates meet criteria of high educational standards, aptitude for teaching, and competence in discipline." (p. 30)

". . . master teachers [should] be involved in designing teacher preparation programs and supervising teachers during their probationary years." (p. 31)

ECS - States should "establish better preserve programs for teachers so that teachers can constantly enrich their academic knowledge and improve their skills. This will require a substantially restructured and renewed curriculum for teacher training, which would include the application of technology.

Each state must upgrade the academic quality of the curriculum for teacher training." (p. 37)

TCF - No comment.

College Board - No comment.

Boyer - "Prospective teachers should complete a core of common learning, one that parallels in broad outline the high school core curriculum proposed in this report . . . the junior and senior year should involve the completion of a major . . . prospective teachers should visit schools . . . Teachers should have a fifth year built around schooling in America, Learning Theory and Research, The Teaching of Writing, Technology and its uses. The fifth year should also include observation and teaching experience. . . . In addition, the fifth year should include a series of six one-day . . . seminars . . . with outstanding arts and science scholar-teachers who would relate the knowledge of their academic fields to a contemporary political or social theme. Such seminars would help to provide the interdisciplinary perspective every high school teacher must acquire." (pp. 308-310)

Sizer - "The main point of all teacher training . . . is that after teacher candidates have gained a solid mastery of their subjects, their training must be almost wholly school based. One learns to teach by coaching: one needs to be teaching in order to be coached. The best coaches are teachers themselves. . . . Lectures on style and on pedagogical technique, on the structure of language and on learning theory, on literary and educational criticism are nice and often useful, but they are only a prologue. . . . One teaches and the process is criticized, the process is incessant. . . . Few undergraduate programs, even at highly regarded colleges, include scholarly experience in bringing together areas of knowledge. . . . Writing and teaching have much in common. . . . While rigorous preparation does not make a great writer, few great writers have not had such preparation. . . . So it is with teachers." (pp. 190-191)

These reports repeat the age-old cliches about the need for more liberal arts—plus Sizer's use of coaching writing skills as an analogue to coaching teaching. The obvious intent of the lack of comment on teacher education in these reports is that the writers seek to fine tune a process assumed to be basically sound: teachers are students prepared in universities by taking courses; if universities select brighter students and have them take more liberal arts courses, a basically sound system will be upgraded; when these liberal arts students go out to teach they will be more able to teach liberal and general studies to

everyone. These assumptions are so far removed from the real world of at risk students and their teachers that to castigate them as irrelevant is to pay them greater respect than they deserve. These ideas were appended—as afterthoughts—to documents aimed at educating children and youth with little thought to the teacher education that would be needed to implement these reforms. Since the reforms do not conceptualize at risk students—as other than remedial cases—it is not surprising that there is no thought given to what is special about urban teacher education.

To some modest extent. the Goodlad work is an exception. He states the following in relation to teacher education:

> Radical breakthroughs are needed in teacher education. . . . Future teachers should experience preparation programs of such length, depth and quality that they will be effectively separated from most of the conventional ways of teaching. They should acquire and persist in using as practice teachers a variety of methods designed to assure students' interest and accomplishment in learning. . . . It is general education that elementary teachers very much need—which when defined, would look very much like the liberal education many of us would find appropriate for all college students. Such education precedes or accompanies professional preparation to teach. . . . The major problem in major universities is a professor of teaching . . . cut off from scholarship. . . . One answer is team teaching. . . . Research expectations work against Education professors. . . . The needed orientation to research transcends traditional research problems and methods . . . in favor of those pertaining to policy and practice in schools . . . the success of professional preparation . . . depends on the degree to which programs are able to separate beginners from the outworn techniques of their predecessors. . . . Teacher preparing institutions must join with school districts in identifying demonstration schools . . . where there will be career and head teachers. Beginners are to be interned only in these schools. University faculty are to be provided space in these schools . . . research and preservice . . . will proceed hand in hand. . . . A two year program of clinical experiences prior to resident status. . . . full repertoire of teaching procedures to be demonstrated. . . . It will be necessary . . . for private funding agencies to try one more time for monetary incentives. . . . Criteria for universities and school districts working together include . . . State officials should suspend existing forms of certification . . . . (pp. 314-317)

There is little question that Goodlad's concepts might be fleshed out in ways that would make them not only relevant but actually useful in urban teacher education, although these do not appear to have been his intentions.

It would be difficult to summarize these seven reports (and the wide array of subsequent reports which followed) if these reports had addressed teacher education in any serious way. In fact, they generally adopted the logical (to them) stance that, essentially, what children and youth need is to learn more subject matter content and so too, do their teachers. They committed the 19th century error of ignoring pedagogy. This is a low level and fatal oversight if the nation is to take the charge of changing school practices seriously. The admonitions to teacher educators—when they do appear—generally "call for" in much the same way as the reforms aimed at children and youth. And in a comparable fashion, there is no recognition, whatever—anywhere—that urban teaching is a different order of practice.

Appendix B: Questions for Teacher Education Program Candidates

I. Persistence

A. Does the candidate persist in trying new or different ways to solve seemingly unending problems?

B. Does the candidate appear to believe that such persistent creativity is a normal expectation of the daily work of the teacher or does the candidate seem to feel the questioning reflects a peculiar set of unrealistic expectations?

Actual Questions

"Give an example of a problem you might encounter as a teacher." (When respondent suggests a problem, ask): "What might you do to resolve that?" (When candidate responds, say): "That's fine! Suppose you did that and it didn't work—the problem continues. What would you do next?" (Continue the process through at least five sequences or until respondent stops making suggestions.)

I.A.

0	1	2	3
Makes no suggestions or irrelevant suggestions.	Tentative about one or two suggestions, then stops.	Makes up to four clear suggestions, then stops.	Makes five clear suggestions and seems willing/able to continue process.

I.B.

0	1	2	3
Respondent does not seem to see persisting as part of teachers' work	Respondent is unclear or tentative about persisting.	Respondent seems to see persisting as part of teachers' work.	Respondent seems to see persisting as a vital teacher activity.

II. Response to Authority

A. Can the candidate identify an activity s/he would pursue as a teacher and recognize that the principal (or other authority) may not support this activity? Would the candidate seek to reconcile this difference in some way that doesn't undermine some worthwhile activity that is helpful to youngsters?

B. Does the candidate demonstrate composure when criticized either in the hypothetic situation (A. above) or during the interview?

Actual Questions

"Can you give an example of something you might do as a teacher that might help students who are having difficulty?" (After candidate gives an example, say): "That's a good idea. After you do that the principal informs you that it is against school policy to do this. What would you do?" (Whatever candidate responds, frame the issue as a choice between backing down from an idea that might help children and getting along with authority.) "Do you always back down to authority?" or "Is it important to get along with superiors?" (State questions in an assertive manner that will give you a basis for assessing candidate's composure.)

II. A.

0	1	2	3
When his/her ideas are challenged, candidate responds in an aggressive or defensive manner.	When his/her ideas are challenged, candidate remains silent or appears confused.	When his/her ideas are challenged, candidate continues to answer by focusing on the issues at hand.	When his/her ideas are challenged, candidate continues to deal with the issues in a patient and good-humored manner.

II. B.

0	1	2	3
Candidate does not see dilemma between his/her practice versus some school rule as a possibility.	Candidate shows willingness to give up any practice if it breaks school policy or rule.	Candidate seeks to continue practice by not informing, or fooling, or finessing authority.	Candidate seeks to negotiate a solution by modifying practice and/or helping authority reinterpret rule.

III. Application of Generalizations

A. The candidate is able to see the connection between a principle, statement of philosophy, research finding, or general concept and specific things that happen in a classroom, or specific things that teachers do, or specific things that children learn.

B. Candidate is willing to consider ideas that may go beyond his/her personal experience or be counter-intuitive.

Actual Questions

(An example of this might be), "There is some evidence that girls don't do as well as boys on SATs in not only science and math but in all areas, verbal level, reading, etc. How does this affect what happens in a classroom?" (Another example might be), "There is some evidence that an atmosphere of competition negatively affects children's learning. How does this affect what teachers do?"

III. A.

0	1	2	3
Will not consider applications of generalization for classroom practice. See generalization about anything to be dangerous when applied to individuals.	Offers a few implications of generalization for practice.	Sees several implications of generalization for practice. Expresses interest in generalization, or how research was conducted.	Sees several implications of generalization for practice. Raises question of whether there is any evidence which might refute generalization.

I.B.

0	1	2	3
Candidate seems unable to connect a generalization with practice, or candidate simply rejects generalization as something s/he cannot agree with.	Candidate seems to be testing generalization against his/her personal experience.	Candidate seems to be testing generalization against what s/he regards as the collective experience.	Candidate seems to be testing generalization against his/her experience *and* other generalizations which might be contrary.

IV. Approach to At Risk Students

The UW-M School of Education is committed to the philosophy that the teachers it prepares hold and act upon high, positive expectations for all children and youth regardless of their economic status, the nature of their family background, sex, creed, religion, race, ethnicity, na-

tional origin or any other attribute—including those commonly regarded as handicapping conditions. Toward this end, the process of selecting students into education programs includes an evaluation of the candidate's perceptions regarding the educability of all children and youth.

In some urban schools, the number of problem or at risk student is much higher than in most suburban schoos. In addition, the likelihood that a teacher will have to work with these students on a frequent, on-going basis increases in some urban school settings.

Actual Questions

"Should urban teachers be paid more than suburban teachers? Why?

IV. A. If "Yes," why?

0	1	2	3
Because the children are hopeless, etc.	Youngsters come from deprived backgrounds; they have disadvantages.	These children have many positive attributes.	These children deserve the best teachers.

IV. B. If "No," why?

0	1	2	3
Same training, same license.	Higher pay won't make a difference.	Teachers have to want to work in those particular schools.	There are individual differences everywhere Good teachers will work with this.

V. Personal Versus Professional Orientation Toward Teaching

Most applicants seeking to enter teaching education programs state that they like (love) working with children and youth. They also state that they get a sense of well-being from seeing children grow, develop, learn. It is also common for applicants to state that it is important for pupils to show some gratitude for all that caring teachers do for them. "They may not always appreciate it while they're in your class; they may come back to see the teacher years later," is a typical type of expectation.

There is nothing inappropriate about these views when used to describe traditional relationships between pupils

and teachers in some school settings. They represent a motivation to enter teaching which will not necessarily be frustrated by subsequent experience as a practicing classroom teacher.

In any school setting, on the other hand, there will be some pupils who do not necessarily like or even approve of their teachers. Similarly, there are effective teachers who recognize they do not like every child or youth in their classes. The device of having a teacher separate what pupils do from what they are, in order to say, "It's their behavior I don't like, not them as people," does not always work. There will be pupils who will remain unlikeable but who must still be taught.

In many urban schools, the number of pupils who do not like or accept teachers, and the number of pupils who are not liked by teachers is increased substantially. Whether pupils like or dislike a teacher, they may demonstrate their feelings in ways which are not readily understood, appreciated or accepted by teachers with middle-class orientations.

Therefore, teachers in many urban schools are headed for difficulty if they expect to be liked (loved) by all students and/or that they must like (love) all students for effective teaching/learning to occur.

The objective of these questions is to focus on the applicants' approach to students: at one extreme are those who need to be overtly adored (these individuals will readily drop out of urban teaching), to those who regard their relationships with pupils to be a professional one. (These individuals may or may not succeed, but they have not defeated themselves at the outset by holding naive expectations.)

Actual Questions

"Is it possible for a teacher to teach a child/youth who shows no respect?" "Is it possible to teach a child/youth who demonstrates s/he actively dislikes the teacher?" No matter what the candidate's response, ask "How would you feel about this if you were the teacher?"

A second set of questions relates to teachers who do not like their students. Is this possible? If so, can teaching and learning still occur?

V. A.

0	1	2	3
Unless children/youth like their teacher, no real learning can occur. Feelings toward teachers control learning.	Children/youth must at least not dislike their teachers to learn from them.	I'm not at all sure that how children/youth feel about their teachers will control how much they learn in their classes.	If children/youth experience success, their feelings toward their teachers become more positive. In any event, the teacher's goal is to generate learning, not love.

V. B.

0	1	2	3
I expect to like something about every child/youth I teach.	I recognize that it may be years before children/youth appreciate what I've done for them.	I'm not sure how well I do is determined by my liking or not like my pupils.	I expect to be an effective teacher with some children/youth I may actively dislike.

This interview schedule is in the process of field testing. I would like to acknowledge the contributions of Linda Post, Marleen Pugach, Jack Stillman, and Ada Rivera for their help in revising and field testing.